YEAR BOOK OF COLLEGE DEBATING

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATES

Edited by
EGBERT RAY NICHOLS
Professor of Speech
University of Redlands, California



VOLUME XXII

NOBLE & NOBLE, PUBLISHERS, INC.
100 Fifth Avenue, New York City

Copyright, 1941
By NOBLE AND NOBLE, *Publishers, Inc.*

Printed in U.S.A.

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

This twenty-second volume of this series of college debates presents discussions inspired by the war and by the New Deal Government of the United States or by both. The war interest, however, seems to predominate as debates on such subjects as "The United States should declare war on the Axis powers immediately," "The United States should join a federation of English-speaking nations," "The Lend-Lease Bill should be enacted," all indicate. "Increasing the Power of the Federal Government" and "Abolishing Agricultural Restrictions" suggest concern over matters of the New Deal. A debate which has both war interest and New Deal implications is the round table discussion by the debaters of Bowling Green College and Denison University, Ohio, on "Direct Action to Prevent and to Stop Strikes in Defense Industries." This particular debate is also of interest because of the form in which it is presented—a radio conversational discussion around the table with the microphone. This type of debate has not, as yet, been developed much by colleges, but its possibilities are great, and it should in the future become a standard type of debate-discussion.

The debate on "Universal Military Training for Young Men Under the Present Draft Age" will be fought again in many different forms next year by the high schools of the country as that is the subject chosen for next season by the NUEA Official Question Committee. The college subject for next season is not

chosen until next September; so no debate on it has been included unless one of the subjects used in this volume is chosen next fall.

Unless the strike situation is quickly solved, it may bob up as next season's big issue. Some colleges are interested in the national debt and the banking situation and inflation for next season. Others see in the war justification for debating an Alliance of the United States and the British Commonwealth, or the Streit Plan for American and British Union. The choice must be governed, of course, by what is pertinent next fall, and likely to remain unsettled and debatable throughout the season.

The war situation, especially the draft, will take debaters here and there from the colleges, but for the most part college debating will continue very much as usual as most college debaters are under twenty-one and will not be taken unless the draft age is lowered. Unless the emergency facing the country becomes much more serious than at present, that is not a likely action.

The array of subjects in this volume is perhaps one of the most interesting in recent years. The debates come from all sections of the country, and are of various types: standard debates, radio discussion, and correspondence debates between teams which did not actually meet on the platform, but wanted to debate bad enough to do it by correspondence.

The tournament debates, as the list of results in Appendix II will show, have gone merrily on during the last season. The popularity of the tournament plan of

debating, discussing, and holding all sorts of speech contests is likely to endure because of its economy, and because of the cultural influence of travel, and the stimulation of forensic and social contacts with other sections of the country upon the individual debaters and contestants.

The Editor feels that the present volume is a very good cross section of the debating of the last season, and presents it to the reader with a great deal of satisfaction as a reflection of what students are thinking and saying, and as an historical record of the debating interest of the day.

He wishes also to take this occasion to thank all the contributors for their co-operation and interest, and to wish them a good debate season in the coming year.

EGBERT RAY NICHOLS,
University of Redlands,
Redlands, California.

CONTENTS

PAGE

EDITOR'S FOREWORD v

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE 1
University of Redlands *vs.* Bates College

FEDERATION OF ENGLISH SPEAKING NATIONS . . . 49
University of Toronto *vs.* University of Missouri

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ENTER THE WAR ON THE SIDE OF GREAT BRITAIN 89
Southern Methodist University *vs.* University of Alabama

LEND-LEASE BILL 119
University of Florida *vs.* Municipal University of Wichita.

UNION FOR DEFENSE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE 155
Weber College *vs.* Virginia Intermont College

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE STRIKES . 199
Bowling Green College *vs.* Denison University

CONTROL OF THE AMERICAN PRESS BY FEDERAL COMMISSION 231
Princeton University *vs.* Colgate University

FEDERAL POLICY OF RESTRICTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION 269
Washington States College Affirmative and Negative

PAGE

EDITOR'S FOREWORD v

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE 1
University of Redlands *vs.* Bates College

FEDERATION OF ENGLISH SPEAKING NATIONS . . . 49
University of Toronto *vs.* University of Missouri

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ENTER THE WAR ON THE SIDE OF GREAT BRITAIN 89
Southern Methodist University *vs.* University of Alabama

LEND-LEASE BILL 119
University of Florida *vs.* Municipal University of Wichita.

UNION FOR DEFENSE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE 155
Weber College *vs.* Virginia Intermont College

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE STRIKES . 199
Bowling Green College *vs.* Denison University

CONTROL OF THE AMERICAN PRESS BY FEDERAL COMMISSION 231
Princeton University *vs.* Colgate University

FEDERAL POLICY OF RESTRICTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION 269
Washington States College Affirmative and Negative

PAGE

POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE INCREASED 313

Iowa State College *vs.* Drake University

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH TO ALIENS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF HOSTILE NATIONS 337

Albion College Affirmative *vs.* University of Michigan Negative

APPENDICES

1. Topic Index of Debate Subjects Appearing in Various Volumes of *Intercollegiate Debates.* . 381
2. Tournament Yearbook: A list of results for the debate season of 1940-1941. 395

INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATES



UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE

A Correspondence Debate

UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* BATES COLLEGE NEGATIVE

The Burke-Wadsworth Conscription Bill and the adoption of a proposition to require military training of young men under twenty-one by the National Committee on the annual High School Debate Subject occasioned the following debate.

Bates College and the University of Redlands, separated by the breadth of the continent, have always wanted to meet in debate, and this season decided to do it by a correspondence plan which it was hoped could later be reduced in size for a radio presentation. The debate was finished so late in the year that the latter project had to be abandoned, but it was felt that the high schools might get some benefit from the discussion, so it is presented herewith.

The question as stated is slightly different from the proposition finally adopted by the National University Extension Association for next year's high school season, being stated as follows: *Resolved, that every able-bodied male citizen in the United States should be required to have one year of military training before attaining the age of twenty-one.* However, the difference is not so great between the two propositions as to make a great difference in the handling of issues.

The debaters taking part in this discussion at both colleges were loud in their praises of this method of debate training, as the average debater under present conditions does not do much writing in comparison to the amount of speaking. Writing debates has a tendency to counteract some of the oral faults of tournament debating.

The speeches were collected by the Editor of this volume. The debate director at Bates College, who co-operated fully in the production of this debate, is Professor Brooks Quimby.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE

First Affirmative, Don Martyn
University of Redlands

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The question for discussion before us is: Resolved, that every able-bodied male citizen in the United States should be required to have one year of military training before attaining the age of twenty-one.

This proposition needs little definition of terms. We all know that young men under the age of twenty-one are not citizens in the technical sense but in a prospective sense. If they are in good health, normal and fit, they are required to have a year's military training or the equivalent thereof if given at different periods of time. We wish to construe the term *military* very liberally also, since all modern wars are industrial and direct industrial training with a military intent, while in government service, should be considered military training.

To understand the necessity for a plan of training such as the one here proposed, it is necessary for us to take a look at the present situation in our country.

At the close of every war there has arisen in America a natural prejudice against required military training. We resolve to depend upon a regular army. Then we begin to starve and neglect this volunteer force and

deny it proper equipment until our military establishment becomes a disgrace and a danger. Then suddenly we are threatened with another world conflict, and embark upon a frantic effort to do a five-year job of preparedness in a year, hoping and praying that we shall not be too late. And so World War No. 2 finds us for the second time in a quarter of a century practically defenseless and unprepared.

As a democracy we probably shall always be afraid of a large and well-prepared regular army. If we depend upon a sudden conscription law to gain us a fighting force in time of peril, we may some day fail to get ready in time. We need a permanent plan of military training which will at all times furnish us with adequate reserves for the immediate expansion of our small regular army. To depend upon frenzied haste and ill-considered conscription plans is a frightful waste and expense, to say nothing of the danger involved.

Our present situation in which we have been caught again without sufficient military camps, barracks, arms and equipment is direct proof that our past and present ideas of military training are unsatisfactory. We cannot hope to defend America without trained men with rifles, machine guns, artillery, anti-aircraft guns, tanks, motorized equipment and training, fighting and bombing planes. If we were actually being attacked today our confusion would become an unforgivable mess and would probably prove disastrous. Of the 16,000,000 men registered for service we are prepared to clothe, feed, and train only a few hundred thousand during the first year. We are faced with months of delay at a

vital time because we do not have a permanent plan or policy. Only one thing seems sure; we are committed to some plan of conscription. Our present law is temporary, and should be succeeded by some permanent scheme of training which will provide us with trained reserves to supplement the small standing army that experience has taught us that we must of necessity retain. This is why we are presenting this plan for compulsory military training for young men before reaching the age of twenty-one. If we are to have conscription, shall it be *before or after* young men reach the age of twenty-one? That is the issue of this debate.

We condemn the present plan of conscription because it does not meet our conditions realistically.

In the first place, it is unsatisfactory because men conscripted after twenty-one are asked to sacrifice a year or more of vital and important time. At twenty-one young men are in the midst of their preparation for life or just approaching the end of such preparation. Twenty-one finds many young men in colleges, professional schools and training courses, and compels them to abandon their plans for a year, perhaps wrecking these plans permanently. Slightly older young men, also subject to draft, are beginning their careers in business and professions and must forego their start in life at a critical time. Many other young men, well started in life, are about to marry and find their plans for settling life rudely and abruptly interrupted by military service at an inopportune time. This makes for resentment and discontent. It is a severe strain upon patriotic sentiments. It destroys morale which is impor-

tant in any army. The present type of conscription also works a hardship upon the business world. The law requires the employer to hold the job open for the return of a conscripted employee. What is the employer to do in the meantime? Go without help or employ some one temporarily. Young men who want to get established in life will not want to take temporary jobs which hold no future for them. Only the desperately needy and inefficient want such jobs and this is bad for business. It makes for inefficiency and waste. The present law declares a moratorium upon the debts of conscripted men and stops their earning power for a year. This is unfair to business and disrupts credit. These things result in insecurity, uncertainty and unrest, and could be avoided by universal military training before the age of twenty-one, before a year's time is such a vital matter. Before the age of twenty-one a young man is in the natural educational and training phase of life. A year of training then is an asset rather than a hindrance. Few young men of this age have contracted serious obligations. The author of the Minnesota Selective Service Plan on which our present conscription law is based, Lieutenant Colonel Joseph E. Nelson, admits that it is a mistake to have men over twenty-five in camp at all. Yet, our law conscripts men up to the age of thirty-six. Mr. Nelson thinks the best period of military training is before the age of twenty-five. Training belongs in the athletic age of a man, and that wanes rapidly after twenty-five. It is most likely to be best between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one. Evidently the facts

of life and of our present social and business customs condemn the type of conscription we have been forced to adopt to meet the present emergency.

Second, our present plan of conscription is unsatisfactory because it takes thousands of young men out of home environment and places them in military camps where the moral influences in their communities no longer apply. In spite of everything that can be done, the liquor business and the red light districts assemble round military camps like buzzards. Recent arrests in Jacksonville, Florida, because of the army camp near by, showed women to be present from Akron and Dayton, Ohio; from Philadelphia, Louisville, Nashville, and other points east and west. Because of the rush to train in military tactics, little is being done to furnish adequate entertainment for soldiers when off duty. The Y.M.C.A., churches, and other groups, previously active, are shut out of the present training set-up. The result will be as it has always been—the spread of syphilis and venereal diseases and the formation of habits that will destroy the health and morals of the best young men of the present generation. America's future depends upon these young men. We cannot stand idly by and let these conditions go on. We face here an intolerable corollary of our present system of military preparation. We can train our young men adequately without taking them out of their homes and the moral environment of their communities before the age of twenty-one, and at much less expense than our present system involves.

Third, our present plan is unsatisfactory because it

does not furnish a constant stream of trained reserves for our regular army. Our present plan is a stop gap; it is spasmodic, and unfit to meet our real need. Unless we substitute a logical plan for it, we shall be without adequate defense training. We must have trained reserves of an athletic fitness always coming up. There must be some of man's natural athletic period left after this training if we are to have our most efficient fighting strength. Our plan of training before the age of twenty-one provides a system of adequate reserves, which can be brought back for short periods of conditioning and additional training. Such a force can be quickly absorbed into our regular fighting force in time of need.

We condemn our present plan of military training because it is uneconomic, wasteful and inefficient.

It is unsatisfactory in this respect because having nc permanent force in training, we allow military equipment to deteriorate, get behind the times and go without replacement. We even let our factories that can supply military equipment and munitions go to rack and ruin. When the emergency arrives, we waste billions in trying to overcome our mistakes and neglect. All the military camps of yesteryear are torn down or in ruins, and have to be replaced in haste at unreasonably high prices. If we had a permanent plan of training, much of our military plant and equipment, our ordnance and munitions, and our airplanes, would be kept in condition for use. At least we would not be caught like Mother Hubbard with the cupboard bare at a critical time. People shrug their shoulders and say this is democracy—we just can't help it. Is it democ-

racy or just lack of common sense and public spirit? Why can't we help it? It is our contention that a sensible plan of military training will tend to keep our military machine in order, and it will keep factories in at least a limited production of war materials. From that situation we can easily expand when the necessity of facing a war arises.

We have shown you that our need for a permanent and sensible system of military training is vital; that the proper time for such training is before the age of twenty-one when the loss of a year's time is not important; when our youth are still athletic and efficient, and can be trained under home environment. We have shown you that such a system of training will furnish us adequate reserves to supplement our regular army, and that such a system will tend to keep us properly armed and equipped.

It remains for my colleague to outline a plan which will meet our situation realistically and efficiently, and to set forth its advantages and benefits as a democratic way to preparedness.

First Negative, Thomas Howarth
Bates College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is fitting that a proposition that concerns every young man from Maine to California should be the subject debated by the students of Bates College and the University of Redlands.

The proposition as worded needs little interpretation on the part of the Negative except that we wish to make

one thing clear, namely: that we understand military training to mean army training and not munitions making or industrial training.

We agree with the Affirmative that the United States must be prepared. But how? Why should we prepare? What are we defending? This was partly answered by the first Affirmative speaker. I was glad to note that he spoke only of the defense of the United States. Apparently he recognizes that the American people are opposed to sending an expeditionary force of soldiers abroad. In fact, one of the provisions of the Burke-Wadsworth Bill is that the men shall be used only for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Thus the administration, the people and the present conscription bill, as well as the Affirmative, point to the fact that our problem is defensive not offensive. It is the duty of the Affirmative to show their proposal of military training for millions is necessary for our defense. Yet the first speaker has hardly attempted it!

Let us look at our defense needs. Do we need this huge army for defense? The 3000 miles of ocean still stand as a formidable barrier, especally when the army is to be transported across the Atlantic. The Germans have been held up for more than a year by twenty miles of water in their moves on the British Isles. How then can we see an army 3000 miles away landing here? The country north of the United States and Canada is unfavorable to the maintenance of bases. The cold weather, the difficulty of keeping supplies and the unfavorable living conditions emphasize that fact. Let us take a look at the map and I think you will be assured

that our coasts and Panama are safe from the attacks of air fleets in Asia and Europe. It is 3,600 miles from the German bases in the North Sea to Boston. It is 2700 miles from Spain to New York, 2,100 miles from the Azores to New York, 4,000 miles from Gibraltar to Panama, etc., which shows us how improbable is the idea that planes can make serious attempts upon our shores in preparation for an invasion. Danger from invasion can only threaten us when our own navy and the navy of England is conquered. It is quite certain that with our important geographical features, weather, water and distance that our nation need not fear invasion from our potential enemies, the dictators, who hardly are ready to shift themselves from the present arena to this hemisphere.

Because our problem is purely one of protection, our navy is the first line of defense. A strong navy is our most essential means of fulfilling our responsibilities and maintaining our purely defense policy. Our navy today is the largest in the world and is unequalled at the present time in equipment and effectiveness. By 1946, five years from now, our navy will be a navy of two oceans. Already it is the only one with 146,000 men and officers not including the 34,000 marines. Admiral Nimitz has stated that he has no difficulty in getting an ample supply of men for the navy. In fact, he had as many as seven thousand on the waiting list before the conscription law was passed. This navy of ours is meeting the purely defense intention of American administration, the people, and the Affirmative. The navy will continue to expand. It will control sea

routes and protect the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts. Yet whatever are the future intentions of the navy, it is certain that a large army will be of no benefit to it. The navy does not need the help of the Affirmative proposal to defend America.

The situation is similar in coastal defenses. Coastal defenses are broadening. They cover such areas as Panama, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Aleutian Islands and numerous other defenses of the army and the navy. Great increases have been made for the defense of the Panama Canal where wider locks are being put in and where the air base is being enlarged. The fact that the army strength before the war was adequate to take care of the existing coastal defenses shows that the recent bases acquired by the United States from England are adding to a good system. The coastal defenses are becoming more and more adequate as the days go by. British land in South America, Trinidad, Panama, Antigua, Jamaica, the Bahamas and Bermuda is now fortified. The Affirmative have not yet shown that there is a lack of men in coastal defenses.

We of the Negative also recognize that an enlargement of the air force is vital. More and more the airplane is becoming vital in the defense of nations. Our safety might depend upon a well equipped air force. Next to the navy it is probably the most important part of our defense program. The air corps is vital to our coasts, islands and bases. They must become more abundant. The dive bomber, the fighter, the spitfire and the long range plane for the defense of Bermuda and Panama are necessary. In short, the air corps must

be enlarged. But here again the Affirmative proposal will give little toward the need. The men to be drafted in the army will not be pilots if they serve for a year only. The air corps needs trained men and pilots that have had experience in the air. Surely the draftees under twenty-one, probably with no previous experience, serving for a year, will be of little aid to the air section of our defense program. Compulsory military training is not the way to get a trained force.

The army of today must be not only specialized but professional. The army cannot afford to be cumbersome and large. The army of today wins the battle because it is well equipped and fast. It has proved its worth many, many times recently as the superior of the old fashioned conscript army. Tanks, tractors, guns and skill in the use of new materials for rapid movement are the direct cause for the destruction of the larger groups of the enemy. The effective organization and the excellent use of co-ordination in these equipped armies is vital. Specialization of men and putting them into the self-sufficient unit is more important than a large army. Such an army has the sanction of such men as Major Eliot. 400,000 men have been recognized as enough. A large army is a risk rather than an asset.

The Affirmative proposal is not necessary for this. In fact, we do not want drafted men who intend to stay in the army for but a year. We can have an ample number of men in the army without conscripting men under twenty-one. Military men outside of the army contend that with a small army and pressure exerted

for enlistment there soon would be ample reserves. The National Guard at its present strength has proved effective. With this substantial nucleus and the aid of voluntary enlistment the well-equipped army which is the best for our defense, can be easily manned and maintained.

Wars today are determined by the economic adaptability of an industrial system to wartime production. Industrial organization is one of the most important defense needs. We must have skilled workers in the metal trades. We must have supplies of war materials, as well as industrial plants. Organization of industry must be maintained so that it can be immediately put on a war-time basis. But compulsory military training in no way meets this general problem. In fact, it takes men from industry instead of preparing them for it.

The Negative agrees that the problem of the United States is one of preparedness for the protection of this nation. We are not to send an expeditionary force. We do not need to fear an immediate invasion. We need a strong navy, adequate bases and coastal defenses, a greatly increased air corps and a mechanized, well-trained small army. We need our whole industrial system so organized that it can be put on a war-time production basis speedily.

The proposal upheld by the Affirmative calls for huge conscript armies and the military training of vast numbers of men. Yet, so far they have conspicuously neglected any attempt to show the need for such an army. They have failed to identify it as a defense measure.

Second Affirmative, Tom Haldorsen
University of Redlands

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In the light of the fact that Congress only last fall adopted a conscription plan to meet the present emergency war conditions, we were somewhat surprised to find the gentlemen of the Negative attacking the principle of conscription throughout and upholding the voluntary system that has been abandoned. The Negative had the right to stand upon the present law and challenge our reasons and our plans for amending and changing it. They have chosen to evade this issue, to forego any defense of the *status quo*, and to champion a small, fully mechanized army of volunteers as sufficient for the defense of our country.

They have done this in the face of the decision of Congress and the President to adopt a selective plan of conscription; in the face of the fact that our war experience all points to the necessity of conscription (witness the World War and the Civil War); even in the face of the fact that we are obligated to defend the entire Western Hemisphere as well as our own country; and in the face of experience so far in World War No. 2. It is true that Germany has not invaded England, but it isn't twenty miles of water that stops her; it is a defense force of two or three million Englishmen completely mechanized and equipped, and aided by a competent air force. Germany has been able to fight effectively at Narvik, Norway, as far away from home as it is from Dakar to Brazil. Germany has sent a very effective mechanized force across the Mediterranean to

North Africa, proving that water is a transport factor not a barrier. No, it is not a small mechanized force that gives security, it is a large well trained and overwhelmingly powerful army that wins modern wars. Germany has not limited herself to a few mechanized divisions. The arguments of the Negative are strangely reminiscent of the Congressional debate before we adopted conscription. We have taken it for granted that we were past that stage and committed to a plan of conscription,—hence our interpretation that this debate is one over the details of conscription. It is the duty of the Negative to answer the Affirmative case. As yet we have heard nothing against our plan of conscription. The gentlemen simply do not want conscription in spite of the fact that we already have it. We think they should be a little more realistic and quit living in the past. The gentleman has said that we have not shown any need for a large conscript force. Do we need to in the face of Congressional action? Do we need to in the face of the possibility that we may have to meet German forces in Latin America in the near future or give up Hemisphere defense? The gentlemen may say that this is improbable, but does that make it impossible? Strange things are happening in this old world these days, and our country prefers to be overarmed rather than to have too little too late, and absorb the punishment now being dealt to England and the conquered nations of Europe. The burden upon the Negative of showing a small army to be sufficient is rather heavy to say the least. That the navy and a large airforce are the first lines of defense are not issues

in this debate. We are for them as much as the Negative is for them. The real issue in this debate is the training of conscript soldiers and *when*—before or after the age of twenty-one.

My colleague, Mr. Martyn, has indicated that (1) our method of handling military defense is haphazard and inefficient, depending entirely upon an emergency for existence, (2) conscription as in use today forces young men to sacrifice a vital year of their lives, (3) that the moral environment of camp life is unsatisfactory, and (4) that the system fails to insure adequate reserves and military supplies and equipment. With these facts in view, Mr. Martyn contended that there is need for a change from the present method.

It is my duty in this debate to set forth a system of training young men under the age of twenty-one and to show that it is practicable and will solve the evils inherent in the present plan of military training.

In regard to a specific plan for the operation of compulsory military service for youth under twenty-one, we advocate the adoption of military training courses to be given in the high schools throughout the nation. Such courses being taken at regular daily periods for four years of the high school course, supplemented by one or two summer encampments, would give a total training period equivalent to one year's concentrated training—thus giving every youth the minimum essentials of training for the defense of America. Under such a plan, of course, provision would be made for conscientious objectors, who would be able to take training in vocations and duties necessary to defense which do not

feature the use of weapons. Youths who do not attend high school could be enrolled in CCC camps for a year and given military training and work service.

Manifestly, competent military officers would have to be used within the schools. Furthermore, federal aid would have to be extended for the construction of armories in which young America could be comprehensively trained. It is to be realized, however, that the federal government would have nothing more to do with our educational system than merely furnishing equipment and officer personnel.

Our plan envisages the training in mechanics, communications, and other phases of military service. This training coupled with tests for aptitudes and records of ability would enable proper distribution of our youth to be made in time of war. We cannot fail to reconcile ourselves to the fact that modern war is industrial as well as military. Consequently, specialized preparation and guidance within the high schools would be of inestimable value in the future national defense.

The compilation of aptitudes and abilities in the high school period would inevitably reveal certain individuals as worthy of becoming officers. Such persons could, through government aid, be sent to college to continue their academic studies and their military training.

Finally, we advocate that youth upon graduation from high school be enrolled in a primary reserve force, which could be called on for further summer training, if necessary, for a period of five years. At that time, these youths would become members of a secondary

reserve which would be called upon only in time of a national emergency.

Fortunately, in adopting a program of training of this nature we do not have to tread along unknown paths. Switzerland, the small but formidable Old World power, affords us a significant lesson. In 1914 Switzerland mobilized 400,000 men in forty-eight hours. For a period of over seventy-five years there had not been a hostile foot set upon Swiss territory. The reason for the comparative peace of this nation may be found in the fact that since 1848 it has followed a policy similar to the one we advocate, of training its youth within the schools, who, after graduation, are subject to periodical preparation.

It is our contention that this simple plan meets the prevalent American need. While not presaging the eradication of our present volunteer army, it provides for basic training to be given within the schools, thus making possible the integration of these youths into the army in periods of national emergency.

Such a plan would forever preclude the possibility of this nation again witnessing the spectacle of total defenselessness in time of danger. Never again would American soldiers be sent to Europe, as in 1917, untrained and unprepared. Never again would a Hitler, the virtual master of all Europe, look with contempt upon the efforts of the American army to become prepared in time. It is our contention that we will never be able to provide a "common defense" unless the high school youth of America are given basic military training.

The remedial actions of this plan are manifold. In addition to providing preparedness for military defense, it would not subject American young men to the possible disruption of their entire lives. After all, who are the men from 21-35, the use of whom is presaged in the present Burke-Wadsworth Conscription Bill? Many of them are men seeking a higher education. Many are learning trades and crafts or entering business and professions. The education and training is, however, rudely broken into, and, in a majority of cases, it will not be finished except under difficulties. If we become engaged in a struggle with the forces of totalitarianism, or any other force, this group will be badly crippled in the search for employment in the reconstruction period after the cessation of hostilities.

Why must we jeopardize the future of young American manhood? It is not to the best interest of American youth to adopt a plan which calls for military training during the proper learning period? The introduction of such a plan would mean that American youth could continue their education in academic or trade studies without the interruption inherent in the Burke-Wadsworth Conscription Bill. These young men could take their military training concurrently with their Latin, Geometry, and mechanical arts. This improvement alone is sufficient to warrant the adoption of the proposed plan.

In the third place, the plan advocated by Mr. Martyn and myself would not introduce into the lives of young America degrading moral influences which are at times close to army camp life. Gen. John J. Pershing has

stated: "In the first World War venereal diseases constituted by far the greatest single threat to the army's efficiency and morale." In this statement may be found one indictment against training in army camps.

If we are to have a prepared youth and at the same time a youth not subject to the moral profligacy which often follows camp life, we must instigate a system of high school training for these youths. In the high schools, within the classroom environment, the careful supervision of parents and teachers would, as it does now, insure proper and adequate entertainment for the young manhood of this nation. In these pliable years when the formation of habits begin, youth must not be subjected to corrupt elements. Only with the adoption of training in the high schools can unsatisfactory influences be eliminated.

In the fourth place, a system of high school training would insure adequate reserves for our army. Hilary H. Crawford, writing in the *Commonwealth Magazine* of April 15, 1940, has stated: "Foot troops have always constituted the backbone of any army." He indicates further that we must not make the mistake of relying too heavily on mechanization instead of men.

Proceeding from the basis that men are the integral parts of any army, we must reconcile ourselves to the fact that an adequate number of trained reserves is essential. Under the proposed plan no longer would America wait for her existence to be threatened before training soldiers. No longer would our hurried preparations lack the mechanical and technical training necessary for them to function efficiently. Every year there

would be 500,000 graduates that could be integrated into the army when necessary. America would thus become impregnable against any enemy which could be sent against us.

In addition to these remedial advantages, such a plan as we propose possesses clear benefits. It would be economical. Under the present system barracks have to be built, soldiers have to be fed, clothed and maintained—all of which is unnecessary under our plan. The money saved could be spent upon additional equipment. This program would lead to more efficient placement of personnel. The aptitudes and capabilities of all high school students could be recorded for later reference. The annual class of trained men from high school would mean a nation always prepared. Constant use of military equipment would insure permanency of the means of production. The wear and tear on equipment would occasion replacement and keep equipment up to date. This plan of training involves men of athletic age throughout their training and service period in reserve. The physical training involved would benefit these young men. There would be no loss of time or interruption of careers, as our young men would be trained during the proper learning period.

To briefly recapitulate: We are confronted with the fact that compulsory training is necessary. We have established the fact that there is a need for a change from the present system, because of the inherent evils which exist. We have gone a step further to present a plan by which training would be given to youth under the age of twenty-one—a plan which would meet the

needs of present day America far better than any system we have ever had—a plan which will insure adequate preparedness with the least financial expenditure and the greatest conservation of human energy.

Second Negative, C. Paul Quimby
Bates College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This debate is on a proposal to adopt compulsory military training for all American youth under the age of twenty-one as a permanent peace-time policy for the United States. Now, there seems to be some confusion as to where the Selective Service Act fits into the discussion. As the Affirmative agree, this act is only a temporary stop-gap measure. You will also note that it is not merely a training act but specifically it is a service act as well; and draftees are members of our armed forces and subject to fighting at any time during their year's training. Regardless of whether it may be necessary in time of war or special emergency to resort to the draft, we are debating the permanent peace-time policy of the United States.

We object to universal military training first, because it does not meet the needs of our national defense as pointed out by the first Negative speaker. We have shown that a large navy and air force with adequate bases are our first line of defense. At no time in this debate has the Affirmative produced evidence to show that universal military training is the proper or necessary method to secure those primary defense needs.

And in the face of the statements made by Secretary of the Navy Knox and by high army authorities to the effect that a year's training is not sufficient for the highly specialized services of today, they also have failed to justify their huge conscript army as a substitue for a well trained and equipped volunteer force.

We further object to universal military training because of certain obvious weaknesses. As Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana has pointed out in his Senate speech of August, 1940, conscription is a step toward regimentation and militarization of our country. We must consider that thousands of military men will have charge of such a program; and that means a military bureaucracy capable of indoctrinating our American youth. We see such a program as a step toward a regimented nation. Furthermore, as Major George Fielding Eliot warned us in his address before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, the illusion of military strength that such a large army would create is dangerous. We of the Negative see such an army as an opportunity for war-mongers and interventionists to claim we are strong enough to use them as offensive force. And that is far removed from the principles of democracy.

There is also the very practical objection to universal military training found in the enormous expense it would entail. Think what it will mean in new equipment, new armories, new camps, wages for personnel, and other costly items. It has been estimated that a year's training for one man alone costs $1,500 and with 1,112,500 boys coming of age every year, under this

proposition, it would mean a yearly expense of 1.6 billions of dollars. The calmness with which the Affirmative toss this expense onto the taxpayers without showing how the year's training is really justifiable, is amazing.

The Affirmative have also recognized one of the biggest objections to military training when they point out that it forces youths to sacrifice a vital year of their lives and disrupt their life plans. We agree with all those objections and insist that they hold true especially for those young men under the age of twenty-one years.

Previous to outlining his specific plan of compulsory military training, the second Affirmative speaker criticized the Negative for not already attacking it! But now that it has been presented, let us examine it closely. The plan divides the trainees into two groups: the first group, those who attend four years of high school, will have military training courses as part of their high school curriculum supplemented by summer encampments,—they will be held for five summers of further training in a primary reserve force; the second group: those who are not enrolled in high school and presumably those who do not finish high school, will be trained for a year in camps.

We note that in an attempt to neglect the obvious weaknesses of universal military training, the Affirmative has failed to give equal emphasis to the second group of this proposal, yet we find that more men will be trained by this second method than the first. According to the biennial survey published by the United States Office of Education, *Statistics of Public High*

Schools, 1937-38, out of 1,112,500 boys who come under this proposal each year only 480,000 graduate from the four-year high schools, while over 600,000 boys in the second group will be training in camps. The proposition of this debate calls for military training for all youth under twenty-one, and the Affirmative have dwelt wholly on what they intend to do with less than half those trainees. They evidently intend to train the greater percentage, over 600,000 boys under the same conditions they have denounced themselves as uneconomic, wasteful, inefficient, and degrading.

As regards the high school training, we find that it is some sort of wild idea concocted by our friends of the Affirmative. They have given us no precedents for the success of such a scheme. They have failed to show us that this is the equivalent to one year's training of the kind we need for our defense. They claim that high school training is adequate to "insure adequate reserves for our army" and to prove it they have quoted a Hilary H. Crawford as saying that "foot troops have always constituted the backbone of any army"; but this in no way shows us that the *high school training* will be adequate! Military training experts such as Major George Fielding Eliot and Major General John C. Fuller, of the British Tank Corps, agree that one year of training is not adequate for the specialized training required for our modern needs. We cannot see how this high school training could possibly equal a year's intensive training, and these experts agree that even a year's intensive training isn't enough.

The Affirmative have told us that "the federal gov-

ernment would have nothing more to do with our educational system than merely furnishing equipment and officer personnel," but they have not told us how they are going to insert the training into the curriculum. If the military men are going to do the re-arranging of the curriculum, then it will mean a drastic shake-up in our educational system with longer hours, shorter periods for sports and extra-curricular activities, more work for the students, a drag on the interests of the student, and the danger of indoctrination. If the re-arranging is to be left in the hands of the educational men, then we cannot be sure that the training will be at all adequate for our military needs. There is no alternative but to drag the training out into a period of summer work.

The Affirmative does not want to "jeopardize the future of young American manhood," yet they propose to make demands on his time, interest, and effort for at least four years of high school work and probably seven summers. They decry the disruption of one year of a person's life and then offer a plan in which parts of nine years will be commanded and dictated by the Government. How can a youth plan any summer work if he is going to be disrupted like this? How is he going to keep a good job under these circumstances? And the Affirmative even go so far as to ask that bright pupils be sent through four years of college to be further militarized. Both speakers have deplored the moral environment of camp life, yet they have proposed seven summers of camp life for their recruits. We are unable to find evidence that these "degrading moral influences"

flourish only in the winter. These insidious evils still will be prevalent under the Affirmative proposal.

The expense of this plan would be practically prohibitive. Equipment for each of the twenty-five thousand high schools could never be made adequate, for the type of training we need, without the expenditure of huge sums. They claim that money could be saved on board and room during the camp training, yet we fail to see how these great groups of men could possibly be centrally enough located to nestle within the family bosom every night and eat three meals a day at home. Perhaps the commanders will obligingly cut down their military games, battery practices, or drills so that they will take only four or five hours, but this doesn't look to us like the kind of training demanded for our modern specialized service. We cannot see how the expense can be justified since the training itself is neither necessary nor adequate.

But the Affirmative have told us nothing about this second group of over 600,000 boys except that they will be trained in camps. In other words, the most effective objections to the training for more than one-half the youth we are concerned with have already been pointed out in the first Affirmative speech against camp training. They talk about sacrificing a vital year of a man's life and then propose to disrupt the lives of 600,000 boys every year under their program. They talk about the bad moral environment of camp life, and then propose to put 600,000 boys every year in the bad moral environment of camp life. They talk of the gigantic expense of camp life, and then propose to put 600,000

boys every year in the wasteful and expensive system of training camps. They talk of the physical value of training, and yet propose a system that cannot adequately train boys and give them work at the same time.

In short, the first group of boys in a four year high school will be given military training in the curriculum, but as yet we have received no arguments, no evidence, and no precedents to prove that the training will equal a year's concentrated training or be adequate for our defense needs. We see it rather as a step likely to disrupt our educational system; to interrupt the lives of our youth for parts of nine years and create an unhealthy illusion of military strength; to start regimenting the country; to be of tremendous expense; and to be of little military value. The larger second group of boys we are concerned with will have to be taken care of in camps, thus minimizing all the advantages that the Affirmative plan for their training, making the Affirmative plan open to all the objections that they have so eloquently expressed in regard to camp training.

First Negative Rebuttal, Thomas Howarth
Bates College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Unwittingly our friends from Redlands have shown at least one possible advantage of future military training in schools. They show a lack of co-ordination in attack. For example, in one case the first speaker objects to our present situation on the ground that we were caught without sufficient

barracks. Yet the second speaker objects to the present conscription bill as requiring unnecessary barracks to be built and lists as one of the advantages of his plan that it would save money since barracks would be unnecessary.

In another instance the Affirmative say that because of the present Selective Service Act we are committed to the principle of conscription as a permanent policy and then object to the present bill because it is a temporary, stop-gap measure.

One speaker condemns military camps as the breeding place of evil and corruption, yet the other offers a plan which puts nearly half a million men in camps for from one to nine summers and subjects more than half a million more to one full year in military camp.

The Affirmative in this debate are proposing a permanent policy of universal military training. This means that all men under twenty-one must have a year of military training to provide material for a vast conscript army. We claim that the navy, air force and coastal defenses are adequate as the first line of defense. We claim that these primary defenses and a well-trained adequate army can be secured by voluntary enlistment in time of peace.

The Affirmative have admitted most of our contentions. They have not denied that American policy should be for our own defense. They have agreed that the navy and air forces with adequate bases are our

On April 12, 1941, we had 1,105,359 men in our armed forces not including the selective service trainees —over one million men in our volunteer forces. This includes an army of 800,000 men.

The Affirmative must show a need for a greater army permanently in addition to our first line of defense or must show that a greater army could not be obtained by a voluntary method were it necessary.

Let us examine their speeches and see how they have attempted to show this need. The only use that they have stated specifically for these extra men is that they might need to send them to South America. In no way have they attempted to show that adequate air power, our navy, and adequate bases would not be sufficient for the defense of the entire hemisphere. May I point out that at no time have they claimed that they will use their conscript men for anything but army duty. They realize that the air force and the navy are best filled by volunteer methods.

To prove the necessity of universal military training in time of peace they point out conscription in time of war. To show the need of conscripts they point to Germany but Germany is on the offensive and has operated against enemies on or near her own continent. In Greece, Lochner of the Associated Press learned from Australian leaders that it was lack of air forces and equipment that lost the campaign against Germany.

The Affirmative has mentioned Switzerland. Yet war correspondents point out that the geographic position and the fact that the Germans want to use the Swiss

railroads to transport coal to Italy is more important for their peace than conscript armies.

Look at other European nations that have been depending on conscription and see what has happened to them. The Affirmative singled out one nation with conscription that has not fallen to the Germans, yet they neglect to point to the nations with conscription that have fallen. Did they forget France, Poland and Yugoslavia? Here are nations that fell partly because they depended upon huge conscript armies.

The Affirmative have much left to do in this debate. For example, they must reconcile their objections to camp life with their own plan of subjecting one half million men to camp life each year and 400,000 more each summer. They must show at least some evidence that adequate military training can be given in high school and at the same time allow students to maintain regular school work. They are left to prove that with the army and navy and the air corps as our first line of defense and a volunteer army of nearly a million men we need permanently military training for all youths under twenty-one.

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Don Martyn
University of Redlands

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Let us first clear up some obvious misunderstandings in this debate. The Negative has tried to put us in the position of arguing for conscriptive training as a substitute for the regular volunteer army of the United States. We thought we

had made it plain that these trainees were not to be a substitute force but a supplementary force, or trained reserve, which could be called upon in time of need. We admit that their training would not be as complete or as specialized as that of the regular army, but it would be adequate enough to avoid months of preliminary training in an emergency.

The question at issue is one of military training for young men under the age of twenty-one, but the Negative has been trying to make the issue the defense of the United States. The training of an adequate reserve force is only one phase of our defense. The Affirmative contends that the phase of defense which we propose is not even needed. They are sure we can get along safely with a volunteer army of 400,000 men fully mechanized. The first speaker says that this force is enough and that "a larger army is a risk rather than an asset." In his rebuttal speech he boasts that we now have a volunteer army of 800,000 to a million men. Since we are not at war, we must conclude that we have at least a 400,000 risk on our hands. It is interesting to note that the General Staff does not agree with the Negative and is asking for an army of 1,418,000 men. They recognize that this is the minimum for the defense of the Western Hemisphere, but the Negative is willing to undertake it with 400,000 men.

The Negative maintain that a strong navy and air force with some bases are sufficient. Just what would they do in the case of an attack such as the one now going on in Crete where the air offers a medium of transporting troops who land behind the bases with

gliders and parachutes? Who can say that the turn of events will not force the United States to face the possibility of such an invasion in the Western Hemisphere? How could an army of 400,000 or even 800,000 spread itself over the Western Hemisphere and be effective against this form of attack. The General Staff is advocating the training of 4 million men so that there will be adequate reserves to supplement the regular army in such an emergency. They recognize that our old security is passing and that we must be ready to face the totalitarian threat of the future.

In his rebuttal the first Negative speaker stated that we have 1,105,359 men in our armed forces not including the selective service trainees. According to *Newsweek* May 19, 1941 page 35 the gentleman is decidedly in error. One year ago the regular army consisted of 230,000 men and 13,500 officers. In a year's time (with conscription threatening) enlistment has increased this army to only 473,000 men. This is far from the gentleman's figures, so let us add the 270,000 National Guard that Congress authorized the President to call out, also the Regular, Reserve and National Guard Officers numbering 75,500. This gives a total of 818,500 men. This is 418,500 more than he says we need, but it is 286,859 short of what he says we have exclusive of the selective trainees. There are 480,000 drafted men, which gives us a total army at the present time of 1,302,500 men. This, mind you, includes the selective trainees! If the other figures used by the gentlemen in this debate are no more reliable than their figures on our armed forces, they are indeed in a bad way.

And by the way there are some more figures we want to challenge. The second speaker said that there were 1,112,500 young men who come of age every year and would come under our proposal. He did not give his authority. Out of this group he states that only 480,000 graduate annually from high school, and that we would have to train over 600,000 men in camps such as we have already condemned. He has overlooked several things in quoting from *Statistics of Public High Schools, 1937-38,* of the Office of Education. The figures he quoted left out about 5,000 high schools. They did not include the private schools, military academies, or negro schools, but his figures on men coming of age (which he did not take from this authority) undoubtedly include, if they are accurate, the young men of all races. Next he failed to note that many boys enter high school who do not graduate, but who would get military training in the high school under our plan. Next he failed to note that we did not propose to send these boys to army camps but to the CCC camps. We have not heard any charges against the moral environment of the CCC camps such as are common criticisms of army camps. Any boys dropping out of high school would be sent to the CCC camps. If they did not want to go, they would stay in high school under our plan, or at least finish their military training at the high school. We would continue the work service and the educational program of the CCC. They now have army officers and some military training which we would increase to equal what they would get in high school.

According to his figures only about 40 per cent would

be included in our high school plan, and 60 per cent in the CCC training. Obviously this is wrong and any one who knows his own community knows these figures are absurd. According to his own authority, nearly seventy per cent of that age group attend high school for at least part of the course, and so would be reached by our plan.

Also, because we suggested summer training, they jumped at the conclusion that we would take every summer during the high school course and the five year reserve period. This would not be necessary when we are merely supplementing the regular army and not training a force to substitute for it. The gentlemen are afraid of expense but vast facilities are not necessary for the preliminary military training such a reserve force would be given. The estimated expense he suggests is but a drop in the bucket compared to what we are already expending on National Defense at the present time.

The second Negative speaker censured us for saying that the first Negative speaker did not say anything about our plan, when we had not yet advanced it. He overlooked the fact that our plan is included, except for details of carrying it out, in the statement of the question. Probably we should have said he did not attack our proposition, which is training men under twenty-one. The gentlemen have talked about our defense system as if that were the issue instead of the method and manner of training, and of the possibility of depending upon a volunteer army—but neither of them has said that men under twenty-one should not be

given military training. This is a very significant omission.

The Negative have really answered their own interpretation of our case rather than the case itself.

Second Negative Rebuttal, C. Paul Quimby
Bates College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The preceding speaker wishes to make clear that the Affirmative proposes military training for all youths under twenty-one in addition to our regular army, and not as a substitute for it. That interpretation is satisfactory to us; let them show that this additional force is necessary.

To answer our argument that an adequate air force, navy, and bases make a huge conscript army unnecessary, they cite the example of the attack on Crete through the air. They do not show how nearby bases could be obtained in preparation for such an attack on the United States, were our navy and air force sufficient; and furthermore, they overlook the fact that in Crete it is recognized by all military men that it was the lack of air force that prevented the British from holding their own, not the lack of foot soldiers. The example simply proves our point.

Next, the speaker attacks our figures in the debate, and wishes to use the statement that "we have 1,105,350 men in our armed forces not including the selective service trainees" as a criterion of our accuracy. Very well, you will note that the statement of my colleague also went on to say "this includes an army of 800,000

men." Referring to *Newsweek* for Mary 19, 1941, page 35, the preceding speaker states we are definitely in error. Yet, upon examination of this source we find the figures are slightly larger than those we gave. The *Newsweek* statement lists 1,302,500 men as the present strength of the army in May including 400,000 selective service trainees, or an army of 822,000 volunteers exclusive of the selective service trainees,—22,000 more than we claimed! Add to this the number in the navy and marine corps, and we have a figure larger than the original statement!

Then he challenges our statement, which came from the United States Census Reports for 1930, that there are 1,112,500 men coming of age each year. He gives no contrasting figures! As a matter of fact, on page 45 of the same *Newsweek* which he quotes, there is a statement that the Selective Service System estimates that 1,000,000 youths have become twenty-one since last October 16th., which would give a total for more than one year greater than our figure!

To show how many boys would need to take all, or a part, of their military training in military camps, we compared this figure with the number of graduates from high schools rather than those who start high school. Since the proposition calls for a year's military training [which the Affirmative would spread over four years of high school and some summer camps] obviously those who do not go the full four years would have to do a large part of their training in these camps which have been so bitterly attacked by the first Affirmative speaker. He admits that 30 per cent of the trainees

do not go to high school at all, yet he has no right to claim that the other 70 per cent who start high school can finish their military training there.

But the prize evasion of the Affirmative is the insistence of the previous speaker that they do not propose to send these boys to army camps but to CCC camps. Now the proposition calls for a year of military training for all youth under twenty-one, not for work service in a camp. To fulfill this requirement, these men must be given military training. Introduce a year of military training into a CCC camp, and you have a military training camp. If the camps now operated by the government for the training of selected young men for one year now have these weaknesses so eloquently set forth by the Affirmative, why will they be free from them when the same government runs the camps for military training for all high school youth during the summer, and all other youth under twenty-one for one year?

They say that it would not be necessary for high school students to have training every summer during the five year period, but that is a matter of opinion. We have quoted you authorities to show the intensive training needed, and they have given you no authority or evidence to show that it could be acquired even in the full number of summers allowed under their plan.

The previous speaker states that neither of the Negative speakers "has said that men under twenty-one should not be given military training." Now, my colleague spent one whole speech showing it was unneces-

men." Referring to *Newsweek* for Mary 19, 1941, page 35, the preceding speaker states we are definitely in error. Yet, upon examination of this source we find the figures are slightly larger than those we gave. The *Newsweek* statement lists 1,302,500 men as the present strength of the army in May including 400,000 selective service trainees, or an army of 822,000 volunteers exclusive of the selective service trainees,—22,000 more than we claimed! Add to this the number in the navy and marine corps, and we have a figure larger than the original statement!

Then he challenges our statement, which came from the United States Census Reports for 1930, that there are 1,112,500 men coming of age each year. He gives no contrasting figures! As a matter of fact, on page 45 of the same *Newsweek* which he quotes, there is a statement that the Selective Service System estimates that 1,000,000 youths have become twenty-one since last October 16th., which would give a total for more than one year greater than our figure!

To show how many boys would need to take all, or a part, of their military training in military camps, we compared this figure with the number of graduates from high schools rather than those who start high school. Since the proposition calls for a year's military training [which the Affirmative would spread over four years of high school and some summer camps] obviously those who do not go the full four years would have to do a large part of their training in these camps which have been so bitterly attacked by the first Affirmative speaker. He admits that 30 per cent of the trainees

do not go to high school at all, yet he has no right to claim that the other 70 per cent who start high school can finish their military training there.

But the prize evasion of the Affirmative is the insistence of the previous speaker that they do not propose to send these boys to army camps but to CCC camps. Now the proposition calls for a year of military training for all youth under twenty-one, not for work service in a camp. To fulfill this requirement, these men must be given military training. Introduce a year of military training into a CCC camp, and you have a military training camp. If the camps now operated by the government for the training of selected young men for one year now have these weaknesses so eloquently set forth by the Affirmative, why will they be free from them when the same government runs the camps for military training for all high school youth during the summer, and all other youth under twenty-one for one year?

They say that it would not be necessary for high school students to have training every summer during the five year period, but that is a matter of opinion. We have quoted you authorities to show the intensive training needed, and they have given you no authority or evidence to show that it could be acquired even in the full number of summers allowed under their plan.

The previous speaker states that neither of the Negative speakers "has said that men under twenty-one should not be given military training." Now, my colleague spent one whole speech showing it was unneces-

sary and re-emphasized the contention in rebuttal. In my own main speech, I listed several objections to universal military training, in general, and then I went on to attack the fantastic scheme for carrying it out which was fabricated by the Affirmative.

Now what have the Affirmative done? They have attacked the present system of military training of selected youth in camps as immoral, wasteful, and unwise; but they have not shown the need for military training for all youth. They have proposed a wild program of military training in connection with high school work, but in rebuttal instead of answering the definite challenges of my colleague and myself to show any precedent for such a scheme or any authorities who defend it as practicable, or adequate,—the first speaker spends his time in attacking our statistics. If they had any such evidence we deserved an opportunity to examine it. They have neither been able to defend their plan or show that it meets the requirements of the proposition.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal, Tom Haldorsen University of Redlands

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As concluding speaker of the Affirmative I shall endeavor to summarize the entire debate as it has proceeded thus far. The Affirmative has contended throughout that the present system of conscription is unsatisfactory and should be changed; that men over 25 should no longer be drafted, and that a plan of training men under twenty-one should be

adopted. We have presented a plan for training men under twenty-one in the high schools in connection with their education, and in CCC camps, with training in summer maneuvers and war games. The Negative, instead of defending the present system, agreed with our attack upon it and tried to turn our own arguments back upon us in connection with training in CCC camps, but has failed to make charges of immorality against these camps that invalidate our case. The Negative has attacked all conscription, pinning their faith upon a small volunteer army, urging that a large army is a risk and a danger. They have tried to make the issue of this debate our national defense (including the navy, air forces, and bases) instead of a change in the system of training an army which the question calls for. They even went so far as to charge us with substituting insufficiently trained selectees for a fully trained and mechanized army, which we never at any time advocated. However, seeing their mistake, they withdrew this charge in the last speech and admitted our contention that our trainees are intended as reserves only. With this purpose they express satisfaction but deny the need for reserves.

Has the Negative substantiated its contentions that a small volunteer army is sufficient for defense of the Americas; and if they did, is it relevant to the debate? The answer is "no" in both cases. They have nowhere brought convincing evidence that 400,000 men are sufficient to defend the Western Hemisphere under present conditions or those likely to obtain in the future. They say we have not disproved their defense adequacy, but

they are advancing the counter-plan, so theirs is the burden of proof. Moreover, they have abandoned their original position of the sufficiency of 400,000 volunteers and have gloried in the fact that we now have over 800,000 such men in service. They then explained their figures that we challenged by admitting that they had counted the navy and the marines. What have they to do with a discussion over training conscriptees? What about the fact that they said over 400,000 men in the army was a risk? They said we did not need these men, impeaching the wisdom of the present administration. Because we also rely upon the navy, marines, aviation, and bases as well as an army, they claimed we were admitting their contentions. But are these the real contentions relevant to the issues? No. The issue is over training conscripts under twenty-one, not over the other elements of our defense, except as they touch the need for a larger army in our defense.

No need? Here the gentlemen oppose the best judgment of our military authorities, who propose to train at least 4 million. They go counter to the action of the government during the last year. Whether we need conscriptees or not is a dead issue. We have them. This matter was decided (and we think wisely) with the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth Bill last October. We have not thought it necessary to debate the issue of need beyond pointing out the considerations that moved our government to action. Considering the issue settled, we have proceeded to the construction of a permanent system. Against this system what has the Negative countered?

They have called our plan of military training in the high schools a "wild idea," and have attributed the idea of the plan to us alone, and have suggested that we have no precedents to offer. We cited the Swiss Plan, but the Negative turned it aside as a precedent, and said that conscription did not save Switzerland but that Germany wanted to use their railroads and so let them alone. Then they went on with irrelevant argument that nations with conscription fell before Germany. So what? Was that because they had conscription or because of Germany's overwhelming surprise attack upon them? Really, there is precedent here in our own country for military training in connection with educational institutions so obvious we hardly need to assert it. We are sorry time did not permit Mr. Martyn to mention it in his last speech. We do not know what they could say that invalidates it, however. For instance, there is the R.O.T.C. in our colleges and many high schools. If officers can be trained in this way, what becomes of their argument that this sort of training is inadequate and incompetent? Evidently the government doesn't agree. We might remind the gentlemen also of the S.A.T.C. in the World War, where each college with one hundred or more men was assigned army officers and gave military training in connection with regular college work. If this was possible in the last war, a similar plan is possible now in the high schools. So much for precedent.

The Negative fear that such a plan will bring indoctrination, and that America will be induced to set out to conquer the world. This presumes that all mili-

tary officers are militarists in the worst sense rather than humanitarians; that they are dangerous propagandists and not democratically inclined like their fellow Americans. Why all this suspicion of things military? Do the facts justify the assumption? Have the R.O.T.C. colleges and high schools complained?

Now as to the number to be trained in high school and in CCC camps. My colleague has already answered their contentions showing that they left out 5,000 public high schools, all the private schools, academies, and military training schools, such as Culver, Harvard, Urban *et al,*—which destroys the adequacy of their figures as to the number to be trained in CCC. They have made no answer except to say that we suggested that perhaps 30 per cent did not enter public high schools, and urged that these must be trained in camps, and that these were too many to be so trained. There would not be so many to be trained in camps since there are other schools beside public schools available for the purpose. Our opponents have not shown that the CCC could not adequately care for the number. They objected only to the CCC work program for the trainees, as if army training proscribed work. What of K.P., digging trenches, loading trucks, etc! In fact, their objections sound very minor to us, and leave the main argument established.

The matter of expense has been urged against our plan. Our opponents point out that it will take 1 billion 6 hundred million annually and state that this is prohibitive. Is it? How much are we spending annually now in a frantic effort to prepare. Vastly more.

billions more. We could run six or seven years of training on what we are now spending annually, to say nothing of what has been appropriated. The expense can be looked upon as insurance for our freedom and democratic way of life. Surely these are worth an even greater cost.

Finally, we desire to point out that the Negative has advanced only minor objections to our plan, small details mostly, and that their main case against conscription falls under the actual facts of the present situation; that they have failed to destroy the sense of need for an army sufficient to cope with any possible requirement in defense of the Americas; that their contentions are unrealistic and have not met the issues of the debate.

On the other hand we have advanced and defended a plan of training for men under twenty-one, and shown its superiority over the plan now in use. We have shown the fallacy of the Negative position, and submit that the Affirmative case stands practically undamaged in all its main contentions. We therefore, ask that men under twenty-one be given military training.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING BEFORE THE AGE OF TWENTY-ONE

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Adams, Robert E.—*War and Wages.* Primrose Publishing Co. New York. 324 pages.

Aly, Bower, ed.—*Military Training: The Fifteenth Annual Debate Handbook,* Artcraft Press, Columbia, Missouri. 1941. Two volumes, 220 pages each volume. $1.00 each volume, post paid.

American Forum of the Air. Sunday, June 30, 1940.—*Should We Adopt Compulsory Selective Military Training and Service Now? Volume 2, no. 39.* Ransdell, Inc. 810 Rhode Island Ave. N. E. Washington, D. C.

American Selective Service:—Prepared under the supervision of The Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Commission. October, 1939. (Pamphlet).

Beman, Lamar T.—*Military Training Compulsory in Schools and Colleges.* H. W. Wilson. 1926.

Buehler, E. C.—*Compulsory Military Service.* (Debaters' Help Book Series, Vol. VIII) Noble and Noble, Publishers, Inc. New York. 1941. $2.50.

Eliot, George Fielding.—*Defending America.* Foreign Policy. 1939. 25c.

Fitzpatrick, Edward Augustus.—*Conscription and America.* 153 p. Richard Pub. Co. 1940.

Ford, H. S.—*What the Citizen Should Know about the Army.* Norton. 1941. $2.00.

Foreman, C. and Roushenbush, J.—*Total Defense.* Doubleday. P. 1. 1940. 25c.

Grafton, S.—*All Out! How Democracy Will Defend America.* Simon and Schuster. 1940. $1.00.

Johnson, Julia E.—(editor)—*Compulsory Military Training.* Reference Shelf. Vol. 14, No. 6. (Also, see Vol. 12, No. 8). H. W. Wilson Co., New York.

Kenderdine, J. D.—*Your Year in the Army.* Simon and Schuster. 1940. $1.00.

Keyhoe, Donald Edward.—*M-Day.* 96 p. E. P. Dutton. 1940.

Mabie, E. C.—*University Debaters Annual.* Vol. 2. Debate-Compulsory Military Service. P. 79-93. H. W. Wilson Co., New York. 1916.

Nichols, E. R.—*Intercollegiate Debates,* Vols. VI, VII and XVII. Noble and Noble, Publishers, Inc. $2.50 each.

Nichols, Egbert Ray.—*Western Hemisphere Defense.* The H. W. Wilson Co. New York. 1941. 398 pages. (*The Reference* Shelf, Volume XIV. no. 5).

Office of Education, U.S.—*Statistics of Public High Schools.* No. 2, Chapter 5. The Office of Supt. of Documents, Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C. 1940.

Rankin, E. R., comp.—*Universal Military Training.* University Ex-

tension Division, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. 1941.

U. S. Library of Congress.—Division of Bibliography.—*Compulsory Military Training.* A Selected List of References. Washington, D.C. 1940. 25 pages.

Wise, Jennings Cropper.—*Call of the Republic.* Button Pub. July, 1917.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

American Federationist.—48:5, September, 1940. *New York State Federation of Labor on Conscription.*

American Magazine.—131:14-15, March, 1941. *Army's War Against Vice.* C. Woodbury. 131:52-54, February, 1941. *Draft for Peace.* J. Erskine.

American Mercury.—47:257-67, July, 1939. *Impregnable America.* H. W. Baldwin. 48:247-48, October, 1939. *How Impregnable Are We?* Reply to H. W. Baldwin, with rejoinder. R. C. McAdie.

Business Week.—P. 28-29. March 8, 1941. Draftee liabilities: lenders and sellers say law is unfair in part, but plan no great change in policy.

Christian Century.—56:1157, September 27, 1939. *Will Wisconsin Turn Back the Clock?* 57:894-95, July 17, 1940. *No Conscription.* 57:988, August, 14, 1940. *Conscription, Who Wants It?* 57:1126, September 11, 1940. *Draft Law Means Facist Wins.* P. C. French. 58:7-9, January 1, 1941. *Repeal the Exemption!* 58:414-15, March 26, 1941. *What About Army Vice?*

Collier's Weekly.—107:58, February 1, 1941. *Dykstra and the Draft.* 107:62, January 18, 1941. *Keep the Draft Democratic.* 107:154, March 22, 1941. *We're in the Army Now.* H. A. Dunn.

Commonweal.—32:357-59, August 23, 1940. *Against Peace Time Conscription.* P. Burnham; H. L. Binsse.

Current History.—52:11, November 7, 1940. *Director Dykstra.*

Education.—61:213-15, December, 1940. *Open Letter on Military Training; to School Board Members and Committeeman.* P. Revere.

Fortune.—20:116, December, 1939. *Would You Favor a Term of Compulsory Military Service for All Young Men of 18 or 19?* Survey.

Nation.—151:85-86, August 3, 1940. *There Is No Alternative.* F.

Kirchwey. 101:402-03, September 3, 1915. *Conscription: A Summary of the Arguments For and Against Compulsory Service.* J. F. Muirhead.

New Republic.—103:206-07, August 12, 1940. *Common Sense on Conscription.* 103:231-32, August 19, 1940. *Conscription Whom for What?* 103:294, September 2, 1940. *Do We Need Conscription?*

Newsweek.—17:35, May 19, 1941. *First Year of Defense Effort Spotlights Vitality of Nation.*

N. Y. Times.—P. 3. February 23, 1941. *Effects of the Draft on the Rest of Us.* W. F Ogburn.

Reader's Digest.—38:1, June, 1941. *Do We Want a Mass Army?* Rex A. Collings. 37:57-60, October, 1940. *Train Conscripts for War, and for Peace.* J. Erskine.

Scholastic.—38:7-8, March 10, 1941. *Building a Citizen Army.*

School Life.—25:134-37, February, 1940. *Schools Under the Federal Government.* W. C. John.

School Review.—49:195-205, March, 1941. *Retroactive Experiment on Effects of Military Training in High Schools.* D. E. Scates and D. K. Spencer. 47:723-24, December, 1939. *Timely Opposition to Militarism in Education.*

School and Society.—51:261-68, March 2, 1940. *School Military Training Reconsidered.* E. C. Johnson.

Science News Letter.—37:172, March 16, 1940. *Military Training in College Fails to Change Attitudes.*

Time.—36:12-13, September 16, 1940. *Bitter End.* 36:19-20, September 23, 1940. *How the Draft Works.*

United States News.—10:13, June 6, 1941. *Our Army of Tomorrow.*

Vital Speeches.—6:629-631, August 1, 1940. *Compulsory Military Training for What?* F. C. Smith. 6:686-87, September 1, 1940. *Crisis Confronting the Nation.* H. E. Fosdick. 6:689-92, September 1, 1940. *Marching Down the Road to War.* B. K. Wheeler.

A FEDERATION OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING NATIONS

A Forum-type Debate

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI NEGATIVE

The possibility of a federation of English-speaking nations or a plan for an Anglo-American alliance as a defense measure has been the subject of debate for many years, both in this country and in England. With the outbreak of the second World War and the onsweep of totalitarianism and totalitarian methods, the cries for such a union have become louder and more distinct. The group of advocates includes such distinguished Americans as Miss Dorothy Thompson, Clarence Streit and William Allen White. The more numerous English proponents are headed by Prime Minister Churchill, himself, and stoutly supported by the Canadian Minister, McKenzie King. In the debate presented here an actual plan for such a federation becomes real and tangible; it takes on added significance as the background of the debaters themselves is recognized. The proponents of the federation, in this particular debate, represent the dominion of a country in the throes of an actual struggle for survival. The opponents of the plan represent a nation whose main concern is to remain free of the world struggle.

The debate was held at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, November 27, 1940, and was followed by an open forum in which the audience was given an opportunity to question the debaters. The question discussed was, *Resolved: That the United States should join a federation of English-speaking nations.* The debate proper was followed by a prolonged audience discussion of the question and by a vote of all persons present on the motion. The result of the balloting was thirty for the motion and eighty-three against.

The debaters who presented the motion were Mr. Edwin R. Gray and Mr. Edward F. Crawford, Jr., of the University of Toronto. Those who opposed the motion were Mr. Gayton Germane and Mr. Will Rogers of the University of Missouri. Chairman for the evening was Dean Roy Emerson Curtis of the School of Business and Public Administration of the University of Missouri.

The manuscripts, prepared by the speakers, received slight corrections. They were contributed to *Intercollegiate Debates* by Mr. Dudley J. Bidstrup, Assistant Director of Forensics at the University of Missouri.

A FEDERATION OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING NATIONS

Introductory Remarks by Dean R. E. Curtis, Chairman

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We are particularly fortunate this evening in having with us two representatives from the University of Toronto. For a number of years it has been the policy of Forensic Activities here at the University of Missouri to schedule an International Debate, usually with a team from England. This year, however, international conditions were such that English representatives could not visit our country, and the International Debate is between the University of Missouri and the University of Toronto. It is a privilege for me to welcome, on behalf of the University of Missouri, these two distinguished representatives from a Canadian university.

The University of Toronto will be represented this evening by Mr. Edwin R. Gray and Mr. Edward F. Crawford, Jr. Mr. Gray is a senior in Victoria College, University of Toronto. He is a Canadian citizen and a graduate of Humberside Collegiate High School. Mr. Gray was honored in his high school with the Alumni Award for participation in extracurricular activities, and represented his high school in the coronation of His Majesty King George VI. In his sophomore year in college he was elected president of his class. During his junior year he was elected vice-president, and at the

present time he is Student President of Victoria College. He is a member of the Board of Stewards at Hart House, and has been active in debate at the University of Toronto. Mr. Crawford is a senior in St. Michael's College, University of Toronto. He is an American citizen, his home being in Oswego, New York. Mr. Crawford now holds the Kernahan Prize in Philosophy at St. Michael's College, and is President of the Student's Administrative Council. Mr. Crawford is manager of debates at his college, and comes highly recommended as "a brilliant thinker and an able speaker."

The University of Missouri will be represented by Mr. Gayton Germane and Mr. Will Rogers. Mr. Germane is a native of Columbia and a graduate of Hickman High School. He is a senior in the College of Arts and Science, and a major in economics. Last year he represented the University of Missouri in a debate with the team from England, and he has also debated Wisconsin and Harvard. He is a member of Delta Sigma Pi, the commerce fraternity; holds at the present time the office of President in the honorary debating fraternity, Delta Sigma Rho, and is a member of two senior service fraternities, QEBH and Blue Key. Mr. Rogers is a resident of St. Louis. He was the winner of the Extemporaneous Speaking Contest last year, and represented the University of Missouri in the Missouri Valley Forensic League Tournament at Fayetteville, Arkansas. Mr. Rogers is a senior in the College of Arts and Science, and is a major in history. At the present time he holds an assistantship in political science. He,

too, is a member of Delta Sigma Rho, honorary debating fraternity.

The debate this evening is on the question, Resolved: *That the United States should join a federation of English-speaking nations.* It will follow the customary procedure: four ten-minute constructive speeches and four five-minute rebuttals. After the debate an open forum will be held, and anyone may speak who gains the recognition of the Chairman. I take great pleasure in presenting the first Affirmative speaker, Mr. Edwin R. Gray.

First Affirmative, Edwin R. Gray
University of Toronto

MR. CHAIRMAN, WORTHY OPPONENTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Yesterday the future of mankind offered unlimited opportunity, boundless freedom, and eternal peace. Today man's future is blurred and veiled. Opportunity, freedom and peace are terms that can no longer be spoken lightly. Yes, these same words are used as much today as they ever were, perhaps more, but now they are used in an entirely different sense. Not long ago we were talking confidently of the war that had ended war, and of the everlasting peace of Versailles. From the pulpits we heard of a new brotherhood of man; in the press we read about a League of Nations.

Today this mad world is involved in a chaos the like of which her history has never revealed. The everlasting peace has lasted for twenty-one short years; the

brotherhood of man has become a brotherhood of beasts who have torn one another to bitter shreds and left the so-called League of Nations strangled in mud and blood.

It is my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to prove in the few minutes that lie before me that a federation of the United States of America and the English-speaking nations is not merely expedient in view of present world conditions, but that such a union is necessary for the survival of democracy in the future. We are agreed, I am sure, that democracy is that form of government in which the individual realizes that voluntarily he has become an integral part of the government and is bound, therefore, by its decisions. The principles of democratic government include, then, the recognition of the supremacy of the individual as opposed to the sovereignty of the state; the recognition of the value of law and order; the use of rational persuasion rather than coercion; and tolerance for the other man's right to hold definite opinions. In fact, the principles of democratic government are best summarized in the words of your own Declaration of Independence—"the unalienable rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

We possess, then, the same common ideals, the same code of common sense, Christian values, and ethics—in short, the same principles of political and social democracy. The tenets of fascism and communism as demonstrated by Germany, Italy and Russia are diametrically opposed to our beliefs; and, if powerful

way of life. It is, therefore, only logical that we should unite to defend it. Mr. Chairman, our case rests upon the assumption that our way of life is worth defending.

If this danger is the appalling fact of our time, what does it mean to us? We have today no alternative but to stand together. There is no logical alternative. If you pick up a stick by one end, you get the other end with it. If you stand apart, you are going to fall. In the words of your own statesman, Benjamin Franklin, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately." I repeat that there is no alternative to the proposed union. This naive and academic motion, therefore, puts us in the embarrassing position of simply verifying a fact.

It will perhaps be argued that a "league" or even our present organization will give us all the unification necessary. That, sir, we flatly deny. Your history completely disproves it. In 1783 thirteen American colonies fought their way to freedom from an autocratic government. Each colony in turn decided that such revolutionary action must never be necessary again, and to prevent it each colony set up its own government. Their attempt to live harmoniously together under a "League of Friendship" proved to be fatal. Only three years later there was serious trouble, and some of the colonies were at the point of war. But that couldn't happen today? One example alone will suffice. Mr. Chairman, the League of Nations was the greatest of its kind in history. Where is the League today? Born of the bloodiest war of all time, bolstered by the prayers of every civilized people, it lies in com-

plete and utter ruin. Why? Because the fundamental weakness of any league lies in the absence of sovereignty at the center without which unified action is impossible. In other words, the federation of the seven English-speaking nations, co-operating to suppress all purely nationalistic ambitions, is the only remedy for this appallingly sick world, and after all, no doctor has ever cured a patient by refusing to recognize that he was sick. We have seen where the League of Nations is today. Where are the thirteen colonies? In Philadelphia a group of men called visionary and idealistic assembled and said, "Something must be done," and they did it, and today you are living in the United States of America, a great melting pot in which people of different nationalities, religions, languages and customs are molded into one harmonious whole. The greatness of the American Constitution rests on the fact that it established once and for all a central sovereign state. Your history proves it, and in denying the strength of this argument, my opponents must repudiate their own history.

If my opponents are really sincere when they state that a federation is impracticable, they must also logically advocate different political borders from those which now exist. For example, North America should logically be divided into an Atlantic seaboard, a great agrarian belt, and Pacific seaboard. Only such a division would prevent the development of that sectionalism which my opponents will argue renders union incompatible. If they would only realize that the great

plays and dies within one hundred and fifty miles of the American border; and that our culture, language, politics and economics are fundamentally the same, they will understand that one country is simply an extension of the other, that they are merely divided by a border which is but an accident of history. Therefore, if we in Canada, we who are linked so closely with you in the United States as to be one people, if we favor a federation of the English-speaking nations, there is logically no reason on earth why the United States should not join such a federation.

Consider the economic aspect. It is obvious that within such a federation, tariffs and customs would be abolished. Tariffs are imposed today with the sole object of securing sectional or national advantages; and the harm resulting from them to other countries is not considered relevant. From tariffs many international difficulties arise. The United States of America, uniting forty-eight states composed of people differing in almost every possible respect, has grown to be one of the greatest economic powers in the world. The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, said not long ago, "Not only has the rebuilding of a sound economic structure become absolutely essential, but the re-establishment of order under law in relations among nations has become imperatively necessary." You say, "That's true." But why? Why is it true? And how are you going to achieve that end? We all know that tariffs raise prices. This results in a decreased demand for a product. Therefore tariffs make it difficult to buy what we want to buy and difficult to sell what we want to sell. It is,

consequently, impossible to build up big international markets under such conditions. If a country's purchasing power is lowered, its standard of living will be lowered; and it will find itself inevitably groping in a black-out of poverty, depression, and possible war. The whole spirit of tariffs is a spirit of warfare; and with the abolition of tariffs (and our federation would abolish them) that spirit would no longer exist. Moreover, a stabilized common currency which, according to international trade experts, is essential to prosperous international trade, would eliminate that fluctuation of foreign exchange, which is one of the prime causes of uncertainty in business and industry.

Consider then, Mr. Chairman, that a federation of the United States of America with the other English-speaking nations would not only eliminate economic warfare between naturally peaceful peoples, but this tower of strength for freedom and peace would be so powerful on the sea, on land, and in the air that, by the grace of God, never again could the gates of that hell we call war dare prevail against us; and human beings might once more kneel before the sacred shrine and sing together, "Peace on earth, good will toward men."

First Negative, Gayton Germane
University of Missouri

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Rogers and I are honored this evening to welcome Mr. Gray and Mr. Crawford on behalf of the University of Missouri

As you all know, it is almost impossible to distinguish between Canadians and Americans. They are as alike as two peas in a pod. Not only do we have a common language and boundary, common customs and traditions, but also we have common ideals and beliefs. And I am sure that tonight we all hold, particularly, two ideas in common with our Canadian friends: the first, our desire that England should win the present war, and the second, our wish to give Britain all possible aid in her present struggle.

It is on this second belief that Mr. Rogers and I base our case; it is from this standpoint that we would view the present question.

Now obviously, there are only two ways in which such a federation could affect our aid to Britain: either it would hinder that aid, or the natural opposite, it would not hinder our aid.

We feel that it is the very difficult task of our Canadian friends to demonstrate to us how such a huge, complex, and unwieldy organization could fail to hinder our effective aid to Britain, while Mr. Rogers and I would like to take this opportunity to point out a few of the inherent structural defects which such an organization would involve, and some of the many obstacles it would be certain to place in the way of our continued assistance to England.

One of the chief ways in which such a federation would hinder our aid to Britain is through its inherent structural defects. Prominent among these is the great length of time which it would take to set up such a vast organization.

Let us assume for the moment that the plan which Mr. Crawford proposes is this very evening in the hands of the leaders of the nations involved. How long do you suppose it would be until the details could be worked out and the final plan agreed upon? Months or years at least. Even if they did agree on a plan, think how long it would take to set up such a government. Remember, we are not dealing with the slow accretion of powers, or the gradual development of functions, but with the necessity of setting up a whole new government, a government larger, more powerful, more complex than any other government, and dealing with greater issues and more violently conflicting issues than any government the world has ever seen. All of this is to be done, not over a long period of time in a stable and peaceful world, but now, suddenly, in a chaotic and war-torn era.

Imagine, if you can, the difficulty of transporting our government from Washington, D.C., to Los Angeles, California. It would be weeks, months, years, nobody knows how long before it could be straightened out and set in operation again. And yet here we would have no problem of hiring and training employees, of planning, organizing, co-ordinating, and supervising activities. Yet our Canadian friends propose that the way to help Britain, who needs aid now, is to spend perhaps a decade struggling with the plans, problems, and organization of such a super-government, which might, or might not, work. Because, then, of the vast amount of time it would take to plan, organize, and set up such

a colossus, Mr. Rogers and I are opposed to this federation.

Not only would such a federation be undesirable because of the time needed to set it up—if it could be done at all—but also because of a second inherent defect, the tremendous amount of red tape. We all know that we have too much red tape in our own government. We have independent regulatory commissions, numerous government authorities, and special staff and research agencies, all trying to cut down on the red tape and make our government more efficient. Yet this plan which our Canadian friends propose would more than double the amount of red tape in government and set one ponderous administration upon another, all of which is supposed to increase our aid to Britain. I am sure you will agree with us when we say that such a mass of detail and restrictions would most certainly greatly reduce our assistance to England, if it would not make effective aid impossible. We object to this federation, then, because of the great length of time which it would take to set it up, and because of the vast amount of red tape with which such a plan would burden us.

However, there is still a third structural defect which would even further reduce our aid to Britain or stop it altogether. That is the powerful conflicting interests and differences of policy which would inevitably bring such a federation to ruin—even if we were able to set it up, and the great amount of red tape involved did not render effective aid impossible.

Don't you believe that there would be a considerable difference of opinion as to the policy that should be

adopted toward India, for example, or perhaps the opening or closing of the Burma Road? Remember, too, that the most powerful commercial interests of our nation and of the other nations involved will be in conflict. Our cotton competes with Egyptian and West African cotton, our wheat with Australian wheat, our coal with British coal, and our manufactured goods with English goods.

In short, the only interest which the nations of this federation would have in common is the desire for England to win the war, while against this solitary common purpose stand great differences in colonial policy and in the most vital economic and commercial interests. We can all see, I am sure, that the only possible result is that aid to Britain would be overwhelmed in the great conflicts of politics and commerce resulting from this federation.

Mr. Rogers and I object to this federation because of its inherent structural defects, such as the time required to set it up, the red tape involved, and the conflicting interests. These clashing interests alone would certainly wreck such a federation if nothing else did.

A second major reason for opposing such a federation is that it is absolutely unnecessary.

We all realize, I think, that for the last few years British power and prestige in the Far East have been maintained largely by the firm attitude of the United States toward Japan. This is illustrated by the diplomatic pressure exerted by the State Department, our naval maneuvers off the Philippines, and our numerous "good will" visits to Singapore and the South Pa-

cific. Yet we did not have any agreement with Great Britain. There was no federation. The British did not request that assistance. We supported England in the Far East simply because we deemed it to be a wise and practical part of our foreign policy. And for the same reason, Great Britain has always stood ready to defend the Western Hemisphere in case of need. Perhaps it was because of her interests in Canada, or her Caribbean possessions; perhaps it was her tremendous South American trade. But for whatever cause, the fact remains that Great Britain feels that it is a wise and practical part of her foreign policy to stand ready to defend this hemisphere should we need that aid.

Now let us consider how a federation would affect this policy. Would a federation increase our support of Great Britain or Great Britain's potential aid to us? Obviously not, for both are already doing all that they can, as a wise and practical part of their foreign policy.

Then suppose that in the future Great Britain or the United States decides that continued support of the other is no longer a practical part of its foreign policy. Do you believe that any federation or treaty could force that nation to continue its support of the others if it did not feel it was wise? Of course not! It may seem cynical or selfish, but the fact remains that the nations of the world today govern their affairs on the basis of what is wise and practical from their own point of view. The most prominent example in recent times is the Munich debacle in which France sold Czechoslovakia down the river in spite of the most solemn mutual-defense agreements. Why? Because

France no longer deemed it to be a wise and practical part of her foreign policy to continue her support of Czechoslovakia.

Thus we see that a federation of English-speaking nations could not possibly compel support if it were not forthcoming anyway as a practical part of a nation's foreign policy. In other words, such a federation could neither increase the aid which the nations involved now give one another, nor could it compel that aid if they felt it to be unwise or impractical. For these reasons, we say that such a federation is absolutely unnecessary.

In conclusion, Mr. Rogers and I are opposed to this federation because of its inherent structural weaknesses: the length of time it would take to set it up, the red tape which it would create, and the terrific clash of interests it would involve. All of these would reduce our aid to Britain, if aid were not rendered completely impossible.

Not only would these defects hinder our aid to Britain, but, as we have seen in the second major objection, such a federation is absolutely unnecessary and can accomplish nothing that would not be accomplished without it.

For these reasons, we believe that if you want to see England win the present war, if you are in favor of all possible aid to Britain, you will agree with us that we should oppose such a federation of English-speaking nations.

Second Affirmative, Edward F. Crawford, Jr.
University of Toronto

MR. CHAIRMAN, WORTHY OPPONENTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Resolved: That the United States should join a federation of English-speaking nations. My team-mate has pointed out to you the political and economic benefits which the United States would derive from such a federation, and, I believe, has given ample proof why your nation should be willing to participate. For the next few moments I would like to discuss with you the social and moral aspects of the question.

Today the United States is one of the most important nations of the world. Her actions and opinions are observed as closely by all nations as are the developments of the present war. Every act of Congress, every statement of the President, every little shift of public opinion—all are examined minutely in every capital in the world. The reason is that the United States of America is the wealthiest nation in the world. She has the greatest amount of raw materials, of industrial facilities, of electric power, of skilled and unskilled labor, of capital, and of military, naval and air strength. Far more important, however, is the fact that she is the richest and most noble in ideals and heritage. Nowhere is freedom and democracy more highly prized and loved. Nowhere are the forces of despotism more despised. She is loved and admired by free nations, and she is respected and feared by the totalitarian states. Never before has there been a nation as great as this one.

As with individuals so with nations, with greatness comes responsibilities. To let greatness and wealth serve as ends in themselves would be a very grave error. If America, with its abounding wealth in all things, were to sit back and selfishly contemplate its own greatness, what a condemnation it would receive from posterity! Today, as never before, the need for humane contributions is felt throughout the world. Today almost two-thirds of this world is suffering from a diseased mind. The philosophies of the totalitarian states are endeavoring to sap the very life and essence from a Christian civilization and supplant it with a barbaric culture.

We of the Affirmative, in suggesting that the United States join a federation of English-speaking nations, do not urge that the United States and the British Empire become one. Such a union would be beneficial to neither nation. Such a union would immediately bring the United States into the present war, and this, again, would be beneficial to neither nation. Webster states that a federation unites by league or covenant so that each of the uniting powers retains local power. The latter part of that definition is very important: "each of the uniting powers retains its own local powers." In other words, we might say that there is everything to gain and nothing to lose.

Such a federation as we suggest would improve economic relations between English-speaking nations, and, more important still, would encourage the ideals of freedom, truth and justice that are treasured by all. When this present conflict is over, there will really be a

genuine need for such a federation. The peoples of both the British Empire and the United States will be required to safeguard democracy against further assaults. The objection immediately raised is that the United States should in no way entangle itself in any foreign alliances. You must remember, however, that there are two bulwarks of freedom left in the world today, the British Empire and the United States. Both see eye to eye on the question of freedom and democracy. Raised against our system of free government are the forces of tyranny and oppression. When this war is over, it will be the responsibility of free people, as a protection for themselves, and as an obligation to the world, to disprove the theories of the totalitarian system and to establish once more in the hearts of men the concepts of a Christian and democratic civilization. The Secretary of State and the President himself have both reiterated time and again that America will play a major part in the re-establishing of order in Europe when peace comes. The American people should and will rise above such considerations as nationalism and make it subservient to the higher ideals of freedom, truth and justice. To accomplish our known ends, what more perfect system could be devised than a federation of the champions of freedom, the English-speaking nations of the world? They would preserve their own integrity, and they would at the same time be working for a common cause in which they have implicit faith. It would be the greatest work in history. The union would insure this world against another conflict by re-establishing free thought, free

expression, and free worship among those peoples who are now deprived of these things. Our task is not something optional; it is a solemn duty which we should all recognize. It is not a duty to an individual nation or people but a duty to humanity and posterity.

The foundation for such a federation has already been laid. The United States and other English-speaking nations have much in common. Their governments are all of, for, and by the people; their customs and creeds are very similar; their cultures are identical; they have a common language. Each has contributions to make in science, the arts, and the crafts. Each has problems which the others can solve. Slowly but surely over the course of years the trend toward a federation has been developing. International relations among these countries have been the very best; trade agreements have been increasing each year. Within just the last year joint defense measures have been taken by the Dominion of Canada and the United States; and the United States has acquired naval and air bases on British territory. This tendency toward federation is undeniable and one which is not to be stopped.

Thus, I trust you have seen why we support such a proposition. In the first place, it would be a federation and not a union—formed, perhaps, along the lines of the government of the United States. As a federation, it would deal with problems and responsibilities which are common to the United States and other English-speaking nations. It would not force any nation to declare war because another member of the federation had done so. Secondly, there is a need for such a

federation. In order that these nations may solve their economic problems, that new markets may be opened to all, that less expensive methods of transportation and production may be provided, we urge such a federation. Furthermore, such a federation would serve as a means of promoting and expressing new thoughts and ideas—and might, indirectly, aid in solving domestic problems. Finally, such a federation could serve as the means of promoting and re-establishing democracy in a world of freedom. To bring men back to the high and noble place that they were created for is the worthy goal of our federation.

Second Negative, Will Rogers
University of Missouri

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It has been interesting to listen to our Canadian friends extol the wonders of an American alliance with an English-speaking federation. Both Mr. Germane and I believe that this would be a fine thing if it were at all practical, but we feel that it most decidedly is not a feasible proposition at this time. Furthermore, it seems to us that the interests of both the United States and Great Britain cannot best be realized by such a close union. The important question to consider at the present is: How shall Great Britain best be served in the present crisis? It has been aptly demonstrated that England's crying need is not for men but for machines to implement her struggle against the German Juggernaut. The logical place for Britain to obtain these machines is the United

States, and we are of the opinion that America's greatest help can be gained through means other than federation with English-speaking nations. As Mr. Germane has clearly pointed out, the United States can at the present time more effectively concentrate her undivided energies behind an industrial mobilization to produce the needed armaments for Britain by remaining in this hemisphere than by dividing her forces, plunging into the war that certainly would be ours under this idea of federation. The Americas are preparing for hemisphere defense, and, since the United States is committed by the Monroe Doctrine to maintain the *status quo* in this hemisphere, we must prepare for this eventuality.

To the north of us lies the great commonwealth of Canada. Friendship between the Canadian and American people has been of long standing, and it is needless to remind you that the world's longest unfortified border exists between our two nations. Canadians not only speak the same language and enjoy a similar culture and ideals, but also share a close interdependence of industry and labor. The international unions we hear of so much today bring together Canadian and American workers, and a recent example of co-operation is the Canadian-American Defense Commission. As Mr. Macormack has said so well, "The Canadian is more like the American than like the Englishman." Take the important matter of pants. An Englishman calls them trousers and supports them with braces. The Canadian, like the American, wears pants and uses suspenders. He drinks more rye than Scotch, and if

you prick him, he not only bleeds like an American but swears like one. Sports bring our two peoples together, and the radio builds a similar culture.

Looking at a map of North America we see immediately that geographically we are united. We are one contiguous territory. More than that, we find that the present horizontal operation of industry in the two countries is unnatural, and that the natural resources dictate an industry and agriculture running vertically across the boundary. The great lumber belt of the West crosses into both countries. The mining region and the wheat area are located in the two countries. Economically we should be united. For these and many other reasons, Mr. Germane and I wish to propose a Canadian-American union, and if desirable, extension into a Pan-American Union for economic and defense needs. This would not draw the United States into the conflict but would allow both nations to go the full way in production of war essentials.

In comparing the proposal for federation with that of union, it is not too difficult to see that whatever merits the proposal for federation might have, the union retains them and yet eliminates those objectionable features that Mr. Germane has discussed. The eventuality of war is removed; the conflict that could develop with Britain over economic or trade problems is eliminated; those serious questions surrounding India, Ireland, and Hong Kong are not present. Yet at the same time Canadian-American production could be raised to the maximum without a military mobilization to interfere.

Although we can supplement English industry, we

cannot defend the British Isles. From a military point of view Great Britain is indefensible and for all practical purposes part of the continent. By this I do not mean that Britain can be easily invaded but that she can be attacked by means of the airplane. The airplane and radio have ended England's isolation. Just witness the ruin of Coventry and the widespread bombing of English industry. Major Al Williams has pointed out—and events have proved him correct—that up to this time there has been no adequate ground defense against air attack. The British navy can no longer keep her enemy from her shore. Federation under such circumstances is not only unwise from the British point of view but impractical from the American. These things now seem self-evident: First, federation is not the type of organization practical for the present day. There is no contiguity of the territory of the English speaking nations, and India and Hong Kong present very definite problems. Second, the United States is helping Britain as much as possible, and federation could only be a hindrance to the British. Third, the Canadian-American union would consolidate efforts to help Great Britain in her fight and would create a democratic haven for war-torn Europe after it is over. We therefore oppose the proposed federation and advocate a Canadian-American Union.

First Negative Rebuttal, Gayton Germane
University of Missouri

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I would like to elaborate upon Mr. Rogers' point that England is no longer defensible in a military sense. By this we do not mean that England cannot win the war, but we do mean that England must now suffer the destruction that is war, for the channel no longer isolates her from the continent of Europe—she is now in effect a part of that continent. The result is to make England and Europe one unit in a military sense; and it means that in the future, if England is to be protected from attack, she must dominate at least all points on the continent within bomber range. With the constantly increasing flying range of bombers, soon the whole of Europe must be subjugated, if England's protection is to be assured.

As a member of a federation of English-speaking nations, we would be called upon to help dominate Europe for England, as she has not the manpower to do it alone. If the United States wants to be overlord of the world, then such a federation and its necessary military domination of Europe is the logical first step. However, if world domination is not our aim, then the proposed expansion of the Canadian-American Defense Commission offers everything that the proposed federation can offer.

It is interesting to note that our Canadian friends recommend the formation of this English-speaking federation only after the present war. If it is as good and as advantageous as they say, why don't they propose

it for the present, when England is so desperately in need of aid? If they think that such a federation would be other than a hindrance to Britain and the United States in time of war, why do they not advocate setting it up now? From these questions, it seems, by the process of elimination, that Mr. Gray and Mr. Crawford feel this federation would be a hindrance in time of war and could be effective only in time of peace. Then does it not stand to reason that if such a federation were set up and another war were to break out, the federation would be as great a hindrance in that war as it would be in this one? Would not advocates of such a plan be as loath to support it then, in a future war, as Mr. Gray and Mr. Crawford are now? In other words, it seems that the plan which Mr. Gray and Mr. Crawford propose is one which is a hindrance in any but peace time and hence for its successful operation must be composed of members who are never at war. Can we rationally believe that this condition will be fulfilled; that England, who has probably been in more wars than any other nation in the past, will never be in another war in the future? Besides requiring this highly unlikely state of world affairs, this federation can render aid only when you don't need it (in peace and prosperity) and is a hindrance when you do need it (in time of war). This is a serious charge to make, yet it must be true, for our Canadian friends refuse to advocate the plan now or answer our arguments that it is a hindrance at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Rogers and I are opposed to this federation: first, because of its inherent structural de-

fects; the long time required to set it up; the red tape, and the terrific clash of colonial and commercial interests; second, because it is absolutely unnecessary and has no advantages which an expanded Canadian-American Defense Commission could not give us.

Furthermore, when we analyze our opponents' arguments, we see that even they refuse to advocate the adoption of such a federation for wartime use and that its peacetime success is entirely dependent upon the hazardous supposition that there will never be another war.

So again let me say if you want to see England win the present war, if you are in favor of all possible aid to Britain, we believe that you will join us in opposing this federation of English speaking nations.

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Edwin R. Gray
University of Toronto

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Our suggestion of a union of the English-speaking nations has been described by our opponents as impractical and visionary. Edison, Ford and Bell were called "visionary" a few years ago, but today those same men are referred to as "men of vision." And so with the founders of the Constitution of the United States. Washington, Franklin, Hamilton and Madison were ridiculed and laughed at. But what do we find today? A vast United States of America, fusing people who differ in nationality, religion, language and custom into one harmonious whole. In Canada, English and French

live in peace. In the Union of South Africa, English and Boers live in peace; and in Switzerland, French, Germans and Italians live in peace. Visionary? No! It's the most practical solution to the present crisis. It has worked before; it can work now!

One of my opponents has inferred that the purpose of such a union would be to save the British Empire. Such a remark reminds me of the occasion of one of Mr. Gladstone's addresses. At a critical point in his speech some one threw a cabbage, which went rolling along the platform beside him. The Honorable Prime Minister looked at it and smiled. "I am afraid one of my opponents has lost his head," he suggested. This union is to save the people of our democracies from poverty, loss of liberty, and this continual recurrence of war. I should like to make it clear that a nation does not have to make a formal declaration of war to be involved in one, and no one would dare say that the United States is unaffected by the present conflict. Already you have given up a number of international rights. Already your country is filled with spies and propaganda agents of foreign countries. Your foreign mail system has been interrupted. Your supply of raw materials has been cut down at the cost of terrific losses to your merchant marine. You, as American citizens, are right now, by increased taxes and increase of national debt, being forced to spend money on the United States army, navy and air force. I repeat, this federation would be for your own benefit.

The problem of the entrance of certain dominions and colonies has been raised. In regard to this point,

let me suggest that self-governing dominions might enter the federation on the same basis as the mother country. Dependencies that are not self-governing would be placed under the control of an international commission representative of all members of the federation. In regard to India, may I quote a recent statement made at the Indian National Congress: "A free India will gladly join other free nations for mutual defense, economic co-operation, and a new world order based on freedom. With her energies released, India must play her part in world reorganization."

Is distance itself an obstacle? Absolutely not! In this day of radio, telephone, radio-telegraph, cable and airplane, we maintain that London is now closer to Washington than Washington was to California—even twenty years ago. Distance means nothing except in light of communication and transportation; and we venture to state without fear of contradiction that if our present revolutionary development of transportation and communication continues, within the next fifteen years, London will be as close to New York as the latter is to Chicago at present.

I believe it was the first speaker for the Negative who challenged us as to a possible governmental set-up. May I be so bold as to take up the gauntlet and present what we feel might be a practical structure? Such structure would be divided into four powers, the congress, the executive, the supreme court, and the constitution. The house of representatives would be elected in proportion to population. In a consideration of this point we must remember that party lines would cut

across state lines—that a representative is responsible to the citizens he represents and not to the national government. The senate might be made up of two representatives from each nation. The executive would be made up of five men rather than one—three elected by the citizens and two by the senate. There might be a Prime Minister who would be a member of congress and responsible to it. Therefore, by public pressure on congress, he might be removed at any time. He would choose his own cabinet. The supreme court would be independent of national or political pressure. The constitution would be the supreme law. In such a union as my colleague and I have endeavored to present the supreme central government would decide the broad policies of the unified member states, policies regulating intercourse among members and with the rest of the world. Each state would continue to fly its own flag, levy its own taxes, and enforce its own laws. With the principles of the bill of rights as the central foundation, it could only be on the basis of selfish interests that any democracy would refuse to enter the federation.

Second Negative Rebuttal, Will Rogers
University of Missouri

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Gray reminded me of a quip I saw the other day in the paper. Allies are people who probably won't stand by you through troubles you wouldn't have had if you had had no allies. That seems to carry weight in this argument. Both Mr. Gray and Mr. Crawford assume that federa-

tion is necessary, but their reasons I can't see. Of course, if we are to pick up the "White Man's Burden," as the Affirmative have indicated, federation might help, but America doesn't want that; and the point seems to lack both proof and justification. After all, federation is a complicated process, and even if it were as simple "as the American government," it remains rather complicated. Even here in the United States it has been found necessary to centralize administration, and our federalism has proved too cumbersome on many occasions. A federation of English-speaking nations would be unwieldy to say the least. And would Mr. Crawford mind telling us just how it would be accomplished? In what way would our entrance into a federation facilitate aid to Great Britain right now? We fail to see how at the present time greater aid could be given to the United Kingdom without the United States entering the war herself. Mr. Gray suggested that Canada would be cutting herself in two by uniting with the United States. Up to this time Canada seems to be still in one piece in spite of the Canadian American Defense Commission, and that is the type of union we suggested. What we want is a strengthening of the Commission in order to help the British. It seems to us that federation could do nothing except slow down the process. We want to aid Great Britain not cause still more delays. Federation after the war is over is another question and still a rather doubtful one. If we join the federation, and if England wins the war, the United States must be prepared to help Britain dominate the Continent. Are we able to do

that? We wonder if the American people want to do it.

So these questions still remain unanswered: How will federation be brought about? Will it move swiftly enough? How can we defend the British Isles if we do enter the federation? How can we aid Britain more than we are at the present? We feel that the Canadian-American union would be a far better answer to the problem at the present time than the rather unpractical federation of English-speaking nations.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal, Edward F. Crawford
University of Toronto

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In presenting the case for a federation of the English-speaking nations we of the Affirmative do not feel that we are advocating a scheme that is too vast for comprehension, too large for practical purposes, or too ideal for this generation. Those who criticise such a plan need only to look back in their history books to the pages which deal with the founding and development of the United States. There we have an example of the type of federation which we suggest should unite the democracies of the world. In those days also were the critics who advanced arguments against a federal union of our thirteen original colonies, which arguments are paralleled by many advanced by our opponents here this evening.

The federation which we of the Affirmative suggest would carry the same implications, the same obligations, the same guarantees of protection to those par-

ticipating as did the federation which united thirteen weak and quarrelling states into a single unified country. Our opponents tell us that under the federation which we propose, should England be attacked, then the United States would have to come to her assistance. It is impossible for such a thing to happen. For under a federation it would not be England who would be attacked but rather the federation itself. Today Bulgaria could not declare war on Nebraska; if she has any grievances against Nebraska in particular she has to take them out on the whole forty-eight states. And so would the case be in a union of the English-speaking nations.

And under such a federation it is almost inconceivable that any power or group of powers would dare to challenge the combined resources of material and man power of the English-speaking nations once they had been fully mobilized and unified. But in saying this I do not mean to create the impression that such a federation would set itself up as lord and master of the world; that is the exact state of conditions such a union wishes to escape; and it is contrary to the ideals of democracy which are held by all the English-speaking nations. In exhibition of such a good neighbor policy this federation would, from time to time, gladly admit within its folds any other governments who, complying with the standards of the federation as to type of rule and so forth, wished to join this union. Again, is this not also the same method adopted by the United States in admitting states? In answer to any question concerning the government of this pro-

posed federation, all one has to do is to turn to the United States and there find the answer in the Constitution.

There is just one word of warning that I should like to speak to those who criticise this plan on the grounds that it would, to use a very popular and overworked phrase, 'involve the United States in foreign entanglements.' That phrase sounds very well but it introduces an element of thought which should be closely guarded against. I speak of the present-day evil of nationalism. It is a more pernicious sin than it might otherwise be, for today it can be covered under the disguise of patriotism by those who seek to establish it on this continent. Nationalism today is the very backbone of National Socialism and Fascism. Those who raise the cry that America has no interest in the affairs of other nations are, wittingly or unwittingly, advancing the cause of nationalism. For America to stand by and hold itself aloof from the cares of lesser and weaker nations is something that every American should be ashamed to let happen. When the people of the United States have the ability to help others by establishing and maintaining order and justice through a unified strength, it is our duty to do so.

And in conclusion, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me make clear one very crucial point which our opponents failed to perceive: At no time in my direct address did I say that this federation which we are advocating is to be brought into immediate effect, merely for the purpose of aiding Britain in her present crisis. We from the University of Toronto are not here on a mission of

propaganda—we are not pleading for the United States to enter the war actively on the side of Britain. If this country were to declare war now, that would mean that England would then be deprived of the supplies which are so vital to her.

We don't believe that this federation could be accomplished now, simply because public opinion is not ready for it yet. But what we do fervently believe is that when this war is over—and we know that Britain will be the victor—then is the time when this federation is to be formed. Then all of the English-speaking nations will be willing to co-operate in the formation of a nucleus of a world federation of mankind, starting out as an English-speaking federation and admitting new countries the same as the United States admits new states.

This is the best way to work for an eternal peace and it is also the only way. Leagues of Nations, World Courts, and their like have all failed; let's give federation a chance. Firmly united, the democracies would stand—no power or group of powers would challenge them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

A FEDERATION OF ENGLISH SPEAKING NATIONS

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

American Council on Public Affairs.—*The Future of the British Commonwealth of Nations.* 1940. 29 pp.

Angell, Norman.—*America's Dilemma: Alone or Allied.* Harper. 1940. $1.75.

Brailsford, H. N.—*America Our Ally.* Ryerson. 1940. $1.00.

——— *From England to America.* Whittlesey, New York. 1940. 130 p.

Burt, A. L.—*The United States, Great Britain, and British North America.* Yale University Press. New Haven, Conn., 1940. 152 p.

Fabian Society.—*Where Stands Democracy?* (A collection of Essays). Macmillan Co., New York. 1940. 152 p.

Grafton, Samuel.—*All Out.* (How democracy will defend America). Simon Brothers, New York. 1940.

Graves, Charles.—*War Over Peace.* Hutchinson, New York. 1940. 256 p.

Howard, G. K.—*America and the New World Order.* Scribner. 1940. $2.00.

Kraft, T.—*Future of the British Commonwealth of Nations.* American Council on Public Affairs. 1940. 50c. 29 p.

Mackay, R. W. G.—*Federal Europe.* Joseph, New York. 1940. 323 p.

Shotwell, J. T.—*Governments of Continental Europe.* Macmillan, New York. 1940. 192 p.

Siegfried, H.—*What the British Empire Means to Western Civilization.* Farrar. 1940. 15c.

Snell, H. S.—*Britain, America, and World Leadership.* Watts, London. 2s.

Stone, W. T. and others.—*America's Choice Today.* Foreign Policy. 1940. 25c.

Streit, Clarence K.—*Union Now.* Harper, New York. 1940.

——— *Need for Union Now.* Union House. 10 E. 40th. St., New York City. 1940. 25c.

——— *Union Now with Britain.* Harper. 1939. $1.75.

Wells, Sumner.—*United States and the World Crisis.* N. Y. Univ. Law Quar. $1.00.

Magazine and Periodical References

American Mercury.—50:422-8, August, 1940. *Our Stake in the British Empire.* J. T. Adams. 52:312-19, March, 1941. *Is Canada Still a Democracy?* G. Hewelcke.

Asia.—41:7-16, January, 1941. *Things That Could Happen: If America Enters the War; If America Stays Out.* E. Snow. 40:343-6, July, 1940. *Coming: A New British Empire.* C. H. Grattan.

Atlantic Monthly.—166:531-9, November, 1940. *For Mutual Advantage: Mixing Together Affairs of the English Speaking Democracies.* C. K. Streit. 167:133-8, February, 1941. *Singapore, an American Problem.* E. O. Hanser.

Business Week.—P. 48, August 31, 1940. *Canada Takes the Lead.* P. 44-6, August 31, 1940. *United States and Canada Map Joint Defense.*

Canadian Business.—P. 18-20, October, 1940. *Havana Comes to Canada.* S. C. Scabell. P. 24-6; 30-2, September, October, 1940. *United States and Us.* Leslie Roberts.

Canadian Forum.—20:164, September, 1940. *Washington-Ottawa Axis.* 20:380-2, March, 1941. *We Went to the People.* P. Spencer.

Christian Science Monitor Monthly.—P. 15, September 28, 1940. *What England Means to Us.* W. C. Klein. P. 7, October 12, 1940. *English Speaking Union.* M. Browne.

Collier's Weekly.—106:82, December 14, 1940. *Question for Americans: Union Now.* 107:14, March 29, 1941. *Letter to Americans: Statement of Isolationists Position.* Charles A. Lindbergh.

Commonweal.—31:259-61, Jan. 12, 1940. *His Majesty's Government: Criticism of England as Defender of the Democratic Faith.* M. W. Hess. 31:365, February 16, 1940. *Our Cousins, the British; Reply with Rejoinder.* M. W. Hess. 33:345-7, January 24, 1941. *America: Lone Wolf.* P. Burnham.

Contemporary Review.—159:121-7, February, 1941. *America and the War.* J. C. Wedgwood. 158:609-15, December, 1940. *Free Trade as Federal Union.* G. Peel.

Current History.—52:25-7, March, 1941. *To Save Latin America; Union Now of English Speaking Nations Would Keep the Latin Countries Out of the Nazi Orbit.* M. Scully. 52:47-8, March, 1941. *Union Now.* 52:14-17, October 22, 1940. *Should the United States Unite with the British Empire Now?*

Economist.—139:330-1, September 14, 1940. *Allies in Europe.*

Foreign Affairs.—17:753-63, July, 1939. *British Foreign Policy and the Dominions.* H. V. Hodson. 19:269-81, January, 1941. *Is Defense Enough?* R. deRoussy de Sales.

Fortune.—21:88, January, 1940. *Is Albion Perfidious?* Fortune Survey. 22:50-44, December, 1940. *U. S. Foreign Policy: Short of war; Assets and Liability. Items in Any Alliance with Britain.* 23:Sup., 1-20, April, 1941. *Peace Aims. Plan for America's Path*

in a New World Order. Fortune Round Table. 22:51-7, November, 1940. *Canada at War; Its Expanded Industry May Soon Need U.S. Dollars.*

Harper's.—179:485-97, October, 1939. *Future of the British Empire.* C. H. Grattan.

Key Contemporary Affairs.—P. 7-34, Autumn, 1940. *Hemisphere Defense and Aid to Britain.*

Life.—9:103, September 9, 1940. *One Half of North America Joins the Other Half on Defense.* 9:98-108, October 7, 1940. *Plan for Union.* R. E. Sherwood.

Living Age.—359:102-4, October, 1940. *Is Union Possible? Formal Union of the United States and the British Empire.* 359:511-13, February, 1941. *Canada Asks Union with U.S.* J. C. Hainey. 359:501-2. *World over: Possible Effect on the War's Outcome That Might Result From an Immediate Confederation.*

Nation.—152:287, March 15, 1941. *Wheeler's Cliveden Set.* F. Stone.

New Masses.—P. 4, September 24, 1940; October 1, 1940. *The War's Real Aims.* R. P. Dutt.

New Republic.—103:857-61, October 23, 1940. *Alternative to Facism; Proposal for American-British Co-operation.*

New York Times Magazine.—P. 10-11, December 1, 1940. *As Canada Sees Us.* J. MacCormac.

Pacific Affairs.—8:435-40, December, 1940. *Toward a More Perfect Canadian Union.* E. P. Dean.

Queen's Quarterly.—47:2, 133-46, May, 1940. *Canadian Opportunity.* F. T. Birchall. *North America and the War.* R. G. Trotter.

Reader's Digest.—37:92-5, October, 1940. *Plan for Union: America's Future Lies in Union of English Speaking Peoples.* R. E. Sherwood. 38:75-8, March, 1941. *Could We Do Business with the Nazis? German Trading Methods.* D. Miller.

Rotarian.—57:13-15, October, 1940. *Union Now.* C. K. Streit, and B. C. Clark.

Saturday Evening Post.—213:24, March 8, 1941. *Bitter Question.*

Saturday Review of Literature.—23:8, December 14, 1940. *Aid for Britain: British and American Likemindedness.* H. S. Canby.

Scholastic.—37:11-13, December 2, 1940. *Behind the headlines: Canada, Neighbor or Ally?*

Scribner's Commentator.—9:19-22, March, 1941. *Union Now, for What?* H. M. Yates. 9:69-74, February, 1941. *Time to Think American: We Are Putting the Welfare of Other Countries Ahead*

of Our Own. A. Capper. 9:69-74, November, 1940. *America in a Hostile World.* Nicholas Broughton. 9:86-8, December, 1940. *World Island: Plans for the Future Security of Continental America.* A. Hale.

Social Science.—15:356-68, October, 1940. *The World Revolution.* G. S. Pettee.

Survey-Graphic.—30:221, April, 1941. *United States of America: Canada's Problem.* J. B. Brebner.

Time.—36:14, July 22, 1940. *Union Now: U.S.A. and the Six British Democracies.* 36:11-12, August 26, 1940. *Canada and Hemisphere Defense.* 37:15-16, March 17, 1941. *Case for Union.* C. K. Streit. 37:17-18, May 19, 1941. *Foreign Relations: Plain Talker From Down Under.*

U.S. Dept. of State Bulletin.—3:295-301, October 12, 1940. *Fundamental Values in American Foreign Policy.* A. A. Berle.

Vital Speeches.—7:5-8, October 15, 1940. *Let Us Defend Ourselves; America and Civilization Can Be Saved.* (Speech before the Conference for Aiding the Allies, September 18, 1940. Maury Maverick.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ENTER THE WAR ON THE SIDE OF GREAT BRITAIN

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY AFFIRMATIVE *vs.*
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA NEGATIVE

The Southern Association of Teachers of Speech Tournament was held at Birmingham, Alabama, April 1 and 2, 1941. The subject used for debate was: *Resolved, that the United States should enter into the war immediately on the side of Great Britain.*

The two teams which appear in the following debate were finalists in the Women's Division of the Tournament last season, and were ranked a tie; this year they were first and second respectively.

On their way home to Dallas from the Birmingham Meet, the team from Southern Methodist University stopped off at Tuscaloosa to meet the University of Alabama championship team on their own campus. The debate was taken by a staff of eight commerce students and the following copy is a revised edition of their stenographic transcription. The audience which heard this debate numbered about 250 and included the debate squad of the University of Alabama.

The manuscript of the speeches was contributed to *Intercollegiate Debates* by Professor William Ray, Director of Debate at the University of Alabama. Mr. Ray was assisted in the debate arrangements by Professor A. D. Sartain, Director of Debate at Southern Methodist University.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ENTER THE WAR ON THE SIDE OF GREAT BRITAIN

First Affirmative, Silky Ragsdale
Southern Methodist University

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I say before starting this forensic battle, as our most gracious chairman has called it, that it certainly is a pleasure for us to be here with you tonight. We have experienced a fine time in Birmingham, and have enjoyed some of that splendid Alabama hospitality. Mr. Ray told us before we came to the debate here tonight, that, whether we say anything or not, the main object is to keep the audience entertained. We are going to fail because it is our boys' team which does all the joking for the S.M.U. squad—and do they tell the worst jokes! However, we have been told by some of our judges that we talk so loud and so fast that they cannot sleep during our debates.

The question for debate this evening is a vital one at this time for every thinking college student to discuss. It is especially vital for those boys who are just approaching twenty-one, whom Uncle Sam is likely to call into the army in a few weeks. The situation in Europe is changing so fast at the present time that you can't get enough information from the newspapers upon which to base a debate. Something must be done

in the United States to meet the war situation. That is why we have before us this question: *Resolved, that the United States should enter the war immediately on the side of Great Britain.*

First of all, let me point this out to you—such a step is not a drastic step at this time, for the simple reason that we have been going toward this goal, or toward this end, for a number of years. The first thing was the repeal of the neutrality law, as it was known, to permit England to buy on the cash-and-carry plan. And, when England needs became more pressing, and ready cash scarce, we found that we wanted to lend or lease England war materials. Such a bill has been passed by Congress. When we read in the papers, as we did in yesterday's that the "Gestapo has seized eight Americans," we realize that every changing event in Europe makes it necessary for the United States to take a definite part in the war that is going on. We, the Affirmative, believe that the best way to come out a benefactor in the end is to take part in the war at the present time. The members of the opposition, who are stating that we should not go into the war under any circumstances, must realize that it is necessary for us to give all-out aid to Great Britain if she is to carry on. Everyone in this audience would vote for that, for we realize that our future is closely related to the future of Great Britain. It is impossible for us to take any other position. I am not here to contend that we should go in and fight merely for democracy. The fact is, that the United States has never fought for democracy alone.

However, may I suggest to you that you read a book called *Manifest Destiny* (1935, Johns Hopkins University, $4.50), by Mr. Albert K. Weinberg, which will certainly enlighten you on the democratic ideals of America in this war. It is a war for the best interests of the United States when we get down to the concrete facts. For one thing, it is necessary that we do something about South America. It is the first responsibility of the United States to solidify the feeling among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The Latin American nations pledged themselves at the Havana Conference to help the United States in a defensive war; if we should enter this war, they would co-operate to the *nth.* degree. The South American nations must sell their surplus raw products. If the United States was engaged in the war we would need more materials, and South America is the logical place to obtain them. If we were to engage in the war, undoubtedly a high degree of economic unity would be obtained in the Western Hemisphere.

Then, there is a certain psychological advantage of going into war. It would bring a situation in industry that would stop strikes and the closing down of factories—troubles from which we cannot defend ourselves at the present time. There is no co-operation between capital and labor. In one strike, at the Ford plant, some 154,000,000 dollars of defense production has been held up. Eighty-five thousand workers are held out of work on 45 million dollars worth of defense production in another dispute. These are only two of 28 strikes in America in industries needed to give aid to

Great Britain. A declaration of war would not only have a psychological effect upon the people of the United States but would affect the situation between capital and labor.

A declaration of war would make our position clear to all other nations of the world. Here again the psychological effect would be clarifying and effective.

Therefore, I say that if the United States is going to be of help to Great Britain in this war, we must take part. I would like to point out also that there is the time element. Now is the time to send material to Great Britain; now is the time to send the ships,—now, when there are some British people left who would be able to man our ships and fly our planes. The average loss of shipping is 65,000 tons a week. Approximately 16 per cent of the material that we are now sending to Great Britain is not getting there. If our help is to be effective we must enter the war. We must help protect the supplies we send.

The only thing for the United States to do at this time is to give all aid to Great Britain for its own benefit as well as for the benefit of Great Britain.

First Negative, Jane Underwood
University of Alabama

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My colleague and I have been looking forward for some time to this debate tonight and it is with sincere pleasure that we welcome to our campus Miss Silky Ragsdale and Miss Ann Clymer, Dr. and Mrs. Sartain, and the S.M.U. team.

We are very glad to have you, and we hope that you will come again when you can stay a longer time with us.

Now, I hope that you all realize that the main thing motivating us in considering this subject is the desire to decide what policy we should follow that would be for the best interests of the United States. Miss Ragsdale has already stated that the Affirmative believe that the best thing to do for our country is to enter the war immediately on the side of Great Britain. My colleague and I do not believe that we should do this. We believe that the thing to do is to stay out of the war, and we have several reasons for this belief.

First of all, we see no necessity for our entering the war at this time. We feel that we should give all our aid to Great Britain and we are doing this at this very time. We gave our President the legal right to send to Great Britain and to other warring democracies as much war material, necessary for their defense, as we could send them. We have the right to send them materials and we are doing this. We have the right to lend, sell, or transfer all types of war material and we have done that and are doing it.

Shortly after the President signed the Lend-Lease Bill, he signed a seven billion dollar appropriation bill which would send all types of materials, from tanks and guns to agricultural and industrial commodities, to the warring democracies. You see, we are sending all-out aid to Great Britain.

Miss Ragsdale tells us that we should enter the war in order to be sure that the materials we are sending

get to England. She told us just how much of the material we are sending is not getting there now. All of us recognize the fact that the Germans are sinking as many English ships as possible. This danger was present in the World War. The reason the situation is so much graver today is that the English have so few destroyers to attack the submarines. The thing to do, we feel, is to sell, to lend, and to lease to Great Britain as many of our destroyers as we can. We traded them fifty destroyers last September; and we didn't have to declare war to do that. This, we feel, is the thing that is necessary at this time—not an out-and-out declaration of war. We would not only have to send materials, if we declared war, but men as well. By merely leasing or lending more destroyers to Great Britain, we can be sure that the materials get there. We do not need to declare war to help Great Britain win in this fight. There are no materials we could send to Great Britain under a declaration of war that we are not sending her now. The only other thing we can send her is men, and she has told us repeatedly that she does not need them. Churchill has said, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job." Give him our materials and thus we shall be assured of a British victory.

There is a second reason why we do not believe we should enter the war. We believe it is not necessary because at the same time that we are helping Great Britain as much as possible, we are preparing, as well, for the possibility of a Hitler victory. We are promoting the solidarity of this hemisphere. Miss Ragsdale tells us that we must do something about South Amer-

ica, and I would remind you and her that we are doing something and have been doing something about South America for some months. Ever since this war began this country has launched further on a program of improving the economic and military relations between this country and all South American countries. Our goal is to make one economic unit of this entire hemisphere and thus prepare for the possibility of a Hitler victory. The Affirmative do not tell us what we can do in case Hitler should win the war, even though we enter. How do we know that England will win even with the United States fighting beside her? We have seen too much of Hitler's armies, his blitzkrieg tactics, his mechanized might, to believe that a victory is assured just because the United States enters the war. Thus, in case of a Hitler victory, we should be prepared to resist him. That is exactly what we are doing now. We are preparing to defend not only the United States but South American nations as well. We have been leasing air and naval bases there and we have been building new airports. Our government has been helping these nations also by buying more goods from them.

The countries which are at war now have had to relinquish much of their trade with South American countries, and we have been trying to take their places in the South American trade. We have become a great seller to them by using more of their products in our defense program. So you see that we are preparing for the possible eventuality of a Hitler victory by forming a more co-operative relationship with South America.

The fact is that the majority of the South American people favor hemispherical solidarity, but they favor it as a means of defense and not as an instrument of fighting. We do not believe, therefore, that entrance into the war would draw us any closer to South America as the Affirmative claim. In fact, we believe that the only way to make of this hemisphere one economic and military unit is to stay out of the war.

Now we of the Negative believe that in the first place, there is no necessity for entering the war on the side of Great Britain. We are giving Great Britain as much help as possible *without* entering the war. We cannot be assured that we would win even though we did enter the war. In the second place, we are preparing for the eventuality of a Hitler victory by our program of hemisphere solidarity. Therefore, we of the Negative say that we should not enter the war immediately on the side of Great Britain.

Second Affirmative, Ann Clymer
Southern Methodist University

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It looks rather funny to see me carrying all these newspapers round, but at the debate meeting in Birmingham everybody tried to get copies of the latest papers. When you got into the debate, it was not a contest of which team had the better speeches, but which had the latest paper—in other words, of which team had been out on the street collecting the morning and the evening, and all the other editions. It got to be a habit.

The question for debate has come down, as the speaker for the Negative put it, as to what would be to the best interests of the United States. Therefore, the Negative have pointed out to you that the best interests of the country will be served by staying out of European conflicts at the present time. The reasons given for not entering the war now are: first, there is no necessity for the United States to enter the war between Great Britain and the Axis powers at the present time; and, second, that we, by entering the war, can bring about no assurance of the British victory, wherefore we must prepare for a hemisphere defense in case of a Hitler victory. In regard to the necessity of entering the war, the speaker for the Negative maintains that we are giving all possible aid to Great Britain and that we could not do more if we were in the war. There are certain things which are going on in the United States that are keeping us from giving all possible aid to Great Britain and will continue to go on until we do enter into a formal declaration. The first of these is strikes in defense industries which are common news in the daily papers, that the Negative failed to mention. Unless they can point out to you how we can stop these strikes by some other method, it is necessary to stop them by a declaration of war, so that we may get over to Great Britain the aid that is needed.

Now, in regard to the Lend-Lease bill in which Congress gave to the President power to send so many millions of dollars worth of war material—I wish to point out that the Allis-Chalmers strike alone was tying up, and is tying up today, $200,000,000 worth of these

defense orders. Until we can stop these strikes and get labor and capital co-operating in the United States to the extent that we can get the material for which we have orders, we are not giving all aid to Great Britain. The only way to stop these strikes is by a declaration of war for two reasons: first, under a declaration of war the President will have power to force settlement to a greater extent in labor disputes. Second, the declaration would give a moral stimulus. American industry, for reasons that you and I know, would be able to do a lot more if we were today at war with the Axis powers.

Further, in regard to the lend-lease question, my opposition seems to believe that it is a good idea to lend to Britain. Britain has her hands full in carrying on this war and needs all our aid. I might point out to you that at the beginning of the war Britain had at her command about 25 million tons of shipping. Fourteen million tons were her own ships, and 11 million tons came from those willing to lend her aid. About 3 million tons of that shipping was lost when France surrendered. Britain has been losing at the rate of 65,000 tons or more a week. She will have lost more than 3 million tons of shipping before this year is over. And so we may say that it is very necessary for the United States to help her. When the situation is such that 16 per cent of the materials which we are able to manufacture and send are going to the bottom of the ocean, then we say that we are not giving all possible aid to Britain. We could, but we are not, convoying ships. The speaker for the opposition said we could not give

any more aid to Britain than we are giving now even if we were at war. It is our contention that we could eliminate the strikes and that we could convoy ships if we were in the war, and that would be considerable more aid than we are now giving.

Now, in regard to the second proposition, that our help will not assure an allied victory. Our help will at least make it more probable. If we don't declare war against the Axis powers and help England to the fullest extent, we are sure to suffer. It is only a matter of time till Hitler will come over here. Colonel William J. Donovan says: "A beaten England means a threat to America on all sides. We have no choice as to whether or not we will be attacked from East or West—that choice is Hitler's, and it has already been made. Our choice is to choose whether or not we are able to resist Hitler or others who will arise."

Now, then, I say to the Negative that unless we can assure an allied victory, it is going to be a question as to whether there will be a conflict between the South and North Americas. Hitler will have complete economic domination of the entire continent of Europe. That is and has always been his aim. Then he would go into South America and establish economic solidarity. And so we say that the time has come to gain hemisphere solidarity before Hitler wins the victory; afterward there is no hope for hemisphere solidarity. The first speaker has said that the main trouble between North and South America has been that we did not buy from the Americas enough of those products which we could not ourselves produce in the United

States. War would occasion us to buy more from them in order to produce more ourselves. War will place the United States in a position to buy more raw materials from South America, and thus build up better relations. Our failure to buy their products is the human hitch in maintaining good relations with them, and achieving hemisphere economic solidarity.

Now, then, since my time is about up, I wish to say that my colleague and I do firmly believe that the only way for the United States to give the best possible aid to Great Britain is by a formal declaration of war; and that the time to give that declaration is when Great Britain can still profit by it, while Great Britain still has the men to use the materials we send over there. The opposition may say that we shall have to send our own men over there to use these materials. This is not true, for they do not need our men, as they have said time and again. It is for these reasons that we of the Affirmative ask you to agree with us that there should be a declaration of war on the part of the United States against the Axis powers.

Second Negative, Mary Cherry
University of Alabama

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As we reach the last constructive argument of this debate, I think that we should look at the main question before us. I would like to reiterate what my colleague said: that both of us are considering the best interests of the United

States. We believe that we are advocating what is best for our country.

Now, let us look at the Affirmative case and what they believe a declaration of war would mean, and let us look at what we have said we can accomplish without a declaration of war. First of all, they say it is to the best interests of the United States to enter the war because we must gain the support of South America. My colleague has shown that the best interests of both the United States and South America demand that we stay out of war. The South American countries believe in our present policy of hemisphere defense. They will co-operate with us as long as we co-operate with them and do not engage in non-American wars. The Affirmative say that by declaring war we could increase our trade with South America. During the past months while at peace we have been increasing our trade with South America. We are adding more and more to our interests there. Therefore, we can accomplish that aim and advantage without declaring war.

The next advantage the Affirmative has told us about is the psychological advantage of declaring war to combat strikes. They have given us two reasons for that: first, that under a declaration of war the President can force labor to maintain steady production; and second, that the government can deal with strikes. Let us look at what happened in the last World War. One of the worst years in the history of strikes in America was in 1917, just after the United States entered the war. More strikes broke out instead of fewer. The Presi-

dent recently set up a Mediation Board to try to settle the strikes in defense industries. This does not involve a declaration of war.

The Affirmative has also told us that we must have convoys for ships carrying materials to Britain. I should like to reiterate what my colleague has said on this point. We have certain destroyers we can release to Britain to convoy materials. Under the Lend-Lease Bill we can lend, lease, sell, transfer, or otherwise dispose of materials to warring democracies. We can give England the needed destroyers without a declaration of war.

Now we have shown you that there is no necessity of entering the war, because under the Lend-Lease program we are sending all-out aid to Britain now. We are sending everything we possibly can. We are preparing for the possibility of a Hitler victory at the same time by our program for solidarity of the Western Hemisphere.

Let us look at the other things we can accomplish by staying out of war. First of all, our production can go full force today, whereas a declaration of war would mean that we would have to take many men out of industry. Industry would be disorganized and there would be an immediate disruption of business. These products so vitally needed by England today could not get there, because industry could not produce them without the men who are trained to do the job. We must not declare war and disrupt industry. Now another advantage of staying out of war is that our shipping is free from attack to bring in those raw products that we

must have to keep up our production. Our industry has to have certain products from other countries to produce the necessary articles to send to Great Britain. If we declare war, our shipping will be immediately in danger of attack, and probably will be attacked. This would disrupt all that we are trying to produce more and more in the United States for our defense and Britain's.

By staying out of war we will serve as a restriction to Japan. Japan doesn't know exactly what we are going to do. Japan will not declare war because she does not want to have to fight us. If we declare war, Japan as part of the Axis must also fight.

Another advantage is that so long as we don't declare war we can have our representatives in foreign countries today serve as listening posts. So little of the news that reaches us today is actually true. If we declare war, our ambassadors will be called home from those countries, and we will not have the advantage of their first hand information.

Finally, by not declaring war, we can maintain our social standards. All of us know the dark days of the depression and the efforts of the President then to maintain our economic system. He has done much to raise our standard of living, to distribute our wealth more equally. If we declare war, many of our social gains will be lost.

There are many other disadvantages in entering the war. There are several long-time economic costs which we must consider. According to General Robert E. Wood, "In deciding this issue the American people

should face the costs. We start with a debt of $50,000,000,000. With the enormous cost of waging modern war, the cost of sending armed forces over three thousand miles of ocean, of engaging our navy in the far east, we would ultimately face a debt of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty billion. Victorious or defeated, we would be faced at the conclusion of such a war with great economic dislocations. The rich would face a capital levy, the middle classes impoverishment, and the masses a lowered standard of living, and the loss of most of the social gains so far secured." Economic experts tell us the last depression was a direct result of the last war. If we enter this war, we would have to face not only the actual cost of 150 billion dollars, but also the economic disruption which always follows a war. We would have the problem of adjusting the economy of a depleted nation from a war-time to a peace-time basis. There would be the necessary adjustments to private from government ownership. And can we be sure that industry will be turned back into the hands of private owners?

Again, nine million men—or one out of every seven enlisted—lost their lives in the last war. Approximately one-third were injured. Many of these were permanently impaired so that they could not adjust themselves to the post-war world. Must we condemn our youth again to this slaughter? We need not if we can meet the situation without war.

If we enter the war, the soldiers who do come back would face a country that had no place for them. Their jobs will no longer be open. Their rehabilitation

is a problem without answer. Industry would not be able to meet this situation. Unemployment would again be rampant.

Not only do we have these long-time results of economic collapse, necessary readjustment of industry, loss of lives of our men, etc., but we would have the immediate result of disruption of industry so vitally needed by England. Men would be withdrawn from industry to be trained for soldiers, and much confusion in industry would result. We must not disrupt our industry, the most important part of defense today, by withdrawing our men with a declaration of war.

In summary, I would like to say that we of the Negative believe that an Affirmative must show some definite advantage in declaring war that cannot be accomplished without this drastic step. Miss Clymer and Miss Ragsdale have presented three advantages of entering the war: South American interests, the elimination of strikes, and the ability to convoy. We have shown you that a declaration of war would not increase hemisphere solidarity but would disrupt the program to obtain it. The strikes, we have told you, are being met in one possible way. We can release to Britain the destroyers needed for convoys.

On the other hand, there are certain advantages to staying out of war. Production will not be hampered; our embassies can serve as listening posts; we will serve as a restriction to Japan; our shipping will be free from attack; at the same time we can maintain our social gains; and we can strengthen the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

There are certain disadvantages to entering the war, moreover. The immediate disadvantage would be the disruption of industry. The longtime results would be economic collapse, rehabilitation of industry, loss of men's lives and necessary readjustment of the returning soldiers after the war.

Therefore, because there are certain advantages of staying out of war and disadvantages of entering, because no advantages have been presented by the Affirmative that could be brought about only by a declaration of war, we of the Negative believe that we should not declare war immediately on the side of Great Britain.

First Negative Rebuttal, Jane Underwood
University of Alabama

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In coming, as we must, to the halfway mark of this debate, it is well that we sum up what has been said by the two sides in the debate. In the first place, I should like to get one thing clear: we of the Negative feel that a Hitler victory would be a catastrophe to the United States. We do want to do what is to the best interests of the United States, and so we say that the best thing we can do is to stay out of this war.

Our opponents say that it would be to the best interests of this country to enter the war. First of all, they say that we must solidify feelings in the Western Hemisphere; and we say that we are already doing just that. We should try to solidify the two continents

economically and militarily in various ways; and we do not believe that a declaration of war would help. In fact, it would hinder us. South America as a whole is not in favor of a European war, and therefore, there is no reason why a declaration of war would solidify the feeling of the Western Hemisphere.

The second advantage they have given of entering the war is that it would stop the strikes that are occuring the United States today; and we realize that something must be done about that. The President has already created a Labor Administration Board and, with public opinion behind it, this Board will do just as much to stop the strikes as a declaration of war would do. For, as we have pointed out to you, in the last war in 1917, we had the worst strikes that we have ever had.

The third advantage they gave for our entering the war is that we could convoy our materials to Great Britain, and so be sure that they got there. We have pointed out, on the other hand, that we can send England ships and destroyers and convoy these materials without declaring war.

By entering war, our opponents tell us, we could take over the British possessions if England goes down. How they reach this conclusion we do not see. How could we in a state of economic and military war, take over the British possessions? And how could this possibly be an advantage if we did?

We find, then, no advantages of entering the war. We find, however, definite advantages of staying out. We can send Great Britain destroyers; we can get

more materials to her; we can maintain our economic and social gains, and we can keep our listening posts in other countries. These things are mighty important and cannot be overlooked.

We can see many advantages of staying out of war and no advantages of entering. There are definite and very great disadvantages of entering. The first of these is the immediate and long-time cost in dollars. The second is the cost of men—the loss of lives and the injuries that would occur. The third disadvantage is the industrial disruption that would take place. Therefore, we of the Negative maintain that the United States should not immediately enter the war on the side of Great Britain.

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Silky Ragsdale
Southern Methodist University

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I brought my newspaper with me. So little of the news that reaches us today is true, that if we do declare war and bring our ambassadors home from those countries, we wouldn't be any worse off. If any of you would like to buy these newspapers, we would be very glad to sell them as this is our last debate on this subject. These papers do have some very vital statistics in them.

The lady of the opposition who just spoke took a great deal of time to say that there couldn't be any solidarity between North and South America if we declared war; and yet the Negative favor helping Great Britain. They told us that it was economic conditions

that held the Americas together; that was the greatest factor. They said the thing we needed to do was to co-operate with the South Americans economically. Yet, if we are going to get anywhere, as my colleague pointed out, we must buy more from them; and if we declare war we will have to buy more of their raw materials. The nations of the South would co-operate with us. I would like to ask the opposition one direct question—Do they believe that the South American nations would stop sending the materials to England that she needs? That they would stop selling strategic materials to the United States because we entered the war? No, they would sell us more and that would help toward solidifying the economic conditions of the Western Hemisphere. I would like to point out to the opposition that there would be no great economic disruption if we entered the war. There was none in the last World War. We increased our production and would do so again. If we do this, how are we disrupting industry? War effort will tend to increase co-operation and greater production will result. Economic conditions were bad at the beginning of this war, and since it is a war of industry conditions are being helped in our country by war production.

The opposition depends upon a Mediation Board to stop strikes, but they are not stopping. It is going to take a declaration of war to crystallize public opinion against strikes in defense production, to get a realization of the seriousness of the situation, and united sentiment to keep production going. I believe that most people here will agree with me. There are a

greater number of serious strikes now than in 1917. I would like to point out to you also that the number of man hours lost in 1917 was 15.3, but in 1918 after we got into the war they decreased to 6.4. And I am not admitting that there were as many strikes of violence then as now. Even if there were more strikes in 1918 they were a third less, in length of time, than in 1917.

The opposition has intimated that if we entered the war it would be brought home to us since many British possessions are in this hemisphere. If we enter the war, we could take over the defense of these possessions if Great Britain failed, or if Germany won the victory in Europe.

I would like to point out that there is a necessity for convoys to protect the goods we are sending to England. The opposition says that we can let Britain have more destroyers for this purpose. But Great Britain had difficulty in manning the 50 destroyers we gave her. Are the opposition afraid to have our men aboard these destroyers convoying our supplies to England? Hitler has said he will bomb any ship carrying supplies to England, our ships or any ships, with no compunctions of conscience. How do the Negative expect England to get enough of our materials if we do not help in the convoying? To do this requires a declaration of war.

The opposition is worried about what comes after war in the readjusting period. Are we not going to face this any way? A declaration of war will not make it any worse. Inflation comes with such a system

of production as we now have, and not because we enter war. So this economic point of the Negative falls.

Of course we cannot enter a war without having men killed and injured. That is a part of war, but if England's victory is important to our welfare, and the Negative admit that, then we must take that risk to obtain victory.

Second Negative Rebuttal, Mary Cherry
University of Alabama

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In reaching the last stand of the Negative, we would like to make a few things clear. We say that there are certain disadvantages of our entering the war. Let us again look at them.

First of all, we have talked about strikes, and I have quoted statistics about strikes in the last war, and my opponent has quoted statistics that do not agree with mine. The reason they do not agree is that we are talking about different years. In 1918, the number of strikes was cut down to a smaller number. In 1917, however, the year that we entered the war, there were more strikes than at any time in our history. Our opponents say that in war times the President can deal with strikes. We do not believe a declaration of war is necessary or advisable to accomplish this. Public opinion is forming today and can deal with strikes without a war.

Then again the convoy question comes up. Miss Ragsdale has said that we can carry goods to England

in our ships by declaring war; but we do not propose to carry goods in our ships. Under the Lend-Lease Bill our destroyers can go to Great Britain. They have the men to man them; they need destroyers and submarines, and we can send them under the Lend-Lease program.

And now, last of all, we realize that if we entered the war, we would certainly cut off much of our economic relations with South America. South America does not want to engage in non-American wars. She will co-operate with us to a greater extent, building more and more towards an economic program in this hemisphere. If we declare war that would take our attention and energies elsewhere.

Now to sum up the debate. We of the Negative have said that it is absurd to declare war when we can accomplish the same things by staying out. We are now doing as much for Great Britain as we could by declaring war. At the same time we are strengthening our own economic system, establishing hemisphere solidarity, and working toward a greater nation. Therefore, we of the Negative maintain that we should not enter the war immediately upon the side of Great Britain.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal, Ann Clymer
Southern Methodist University

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It has been a great pleasure to us from Southern Methodist University to visit your beautiful campus; we have enjoyed our stay here,

and this debate as well. It seems that there is quite a bit to be cleared up in the remaining minutes at my disposal.

In the first place, there are a number of objections, raised by the members of the opposition, to the declaration of war that we are proposing. The first is in regard to the effect that this declaration will have on the nations of South America. My colleague has stated that hemisphere solidarity would be promoted by a declaration of war. This is unquestionably true; not only that, but we saw in the last war as soon as the United States entered it, several of the South American nations immediately followed our lead. My colleague also pointed out that the main way in which we can have hemisphere solidarity is through our trade, and that trade would not be stopped,—it would be increased by our entrance into the war.

Our opponents do not endorse our entrance into the first world war and say that South America would object to entrance into this war. Do they not know that Mexico and Brazil have already said that they would back the United States to the last degree if we entered the war? The attitude of all South America is similar to that of Mexico and Brazil.

Now it seems that the strike question has become important in this debate and I think it should be. It seems to me that the one issue is: whether it is necessary for us to declare war in order to stop the strikes that are now going on. Whether they can be stopped under the present system or not, the ladies must agree, in time of war the Government has the power to make

strikes an act of treason. May I further point out that the National Defense Mediation Board has not been working with complete success even though they have exerted some pressure on workers to stop strikes. In time of war a superior form of pressure could be exerted on these workers to bring some settlement in the industrial plants.

May I further point out, as my colleague did, that while for a short time after we entered the first world war strikes did increase due to the fact that the government had no way to control capital and labor—the War Industries Board, when it was set up, did adequately control the labor situation as the statistics quoted by my colleague show. If we go into another war, the Government can control all production in the United States and that would answer, I believe, the objections of the Negative.

The Negative has opposed a declaration of war because our shipping would no longer be free from attack. My colleague has pointed out to you that it is not free from attack today, and therefore, no disadvantage is likely to come from a declaration of war.

May I point out that there is no need for America to send an army in the present conflict since England does not need our men. Her real needs are for trained sailors, flyers, and mechanics. We can supply these to England as volunteers and thus render her more real aid than an expeditionary force would. But we must have a declaration of war to do these things. May I further remind you that we must act before it is too late; while England is still holding out, we can render

some real aid to her and her Allies. Therefore, I ask you to conclude with us that the United States should immediately enter the war on the side of Great Britain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

DECLARATION OF WAR ON THE SIDE OF GREAT BRITAIN

Books and Pamphlets

Angell, Norman.—*America's Dilemma. Alone or Allied.* Harper. 1940. $1.75.

Brailsford, H. N.—*America Our Ally.* Ryerson. 1940. $1.00.

Siegfried, A.—*What the British Empire Means to Western Civilization.* Farrar. 1940. P. 15c.

Snell, H. S.—*Britain, America and World Leadership.* Watts, London. 1940. 2s.

Stone, W. T. and others.—*America's Choice Today.* Foreign Policy. 1940. Pa. 25c.

Weinberg, Albert K.—*Manifest Destiny.* Johns Hopkins Univ. 1935. $4.50.

Magazines and Periodicals

American Mercury.—50:422-28, August, 1940. *Our Stake in the British Empire.* James Truslow Adams.

Asia.—41:7-16, January, 1941. *Things That Could Happen: If America Enters the War? If America Stays Out.* E. Snow.

Catholic World.—152:641-50, March, 1941. *All-Out-Aid for Britain.* J. M. Gillis. Discussion 153:1-4, 73-82, April, 1941.

Christian Science Monitor Magazine.—P. 15, September 28, 1940. *What England Means to Us.* W. C. Klein.

Commonweal.—33:531-32, March 21, 1941. *Arsenal of Democracy.*

Contemporary Review.—153:267, September, 1940. *America and the British Cause.* R. B. Mowat.

Congressional Digest.—20:97-8, April, 1941. *Congress Approves All-Out-Aid for Great Britain.*

Current History.—52:11-13, February 13, 1941. *All-Out-Aid for Britain; to Meet the Axis Challenge Effectively We Should Sever Diplomatic Relations Now.* H. F. Pringle.

Fortune.—22:50-54, December, 1940. *U.S. Foreign Policy: Short of War; Asset and Liability Items in Any Alliance with Britain.*

Nation.—150:11, January 6, 1940. *America's Stake in Britain's War.* F. L. Shuman.

New Republic.—104:103-4, January 27, 1941. *Is Lend-Lease Bill a Step to War?* 103:857-61, December 23, 1940. *Alternative to Facism. Proposal for American-British Co-operation.* 104:211-12, February 12, 1941. Discussion.

Saturday Review of Literature.—23:8, December 14, 1940. *Aid for Britain; British and American Like-mindedness.* H. S. Canby.

Vital Speeches.—7:293-96, March 1, 1941. *Let Us Keep Out of Foreign Wars; Kill the Lend-Lease Bill.* A. Capper. 7:267-68, February 15, 1941. *By Aiding Britain We Aid Ourselves.* J. F. Byrnes. 7:299-300, March 1, 1941. *National Self-Preservation; It Would Be Stupid for Us to Go to War.* H. W. Chase.

LEND-LEASE BILL

A Correspondence Debate

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* MUNICIPAL
UNIVERSITY OF WICHITA, NEGATIVE

The following debate illustrates the speed with which events are moving today, and the difficulty faced by debaters in attempting to handle timely questions.

The debate was scheduled to take place through the mails, manuscripts to be exchanged on specific dates, and no changes to be allowed after a manuscript was mailed. The ultimate purpose was to broadcast the resulting "correspondence debate" over local radio stations. Before the final rebuttal reached its destination, however, the Lend-Lease Bill, H. R. 1776, became a law and the debate was never broadcast.

The debate is interesting, too, because of the geographic location of the rival schools. Florida University represents the deep South with its strong adherence to the Administration's foreign policies; the University of Wichita represents the conservative Kansas attitude typified in that State's senior senator, Arthur Capper, one of the chief opponents of the Administration's present stand in foreign affairs.

The manuscript and bibliography was submitted to *Intercollegiate Debates* by Dr. F. L. Whan, University of Wichita, and by Professor A. A. Hopkins, University of Florida. In order to make the record more complete, articles appearing after the passage of the bill have been added to the bibliography.

The question for debate was stated as follows: *Resolved, That the Lend-Lease Bill now before the United States Congress should be immediately passed.*

LEND-LEASE BILL

First Affirmative, Sidney Aronovitz
University of Florida

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Eastern Hemisphere today portrays a scene of a "world in flames"—a world encompassed in war, suffering, enmity, hatred and distrust. Man over there no longer lives the free, happy life which he contemplated centuries ago when he established government to care for his increasing needs.

On the other hand, standing aloof, but ever on the edge of becoming involved, the Western Hemisphere is by comparison, a paradise of peace. Over here we still know what it means to be free and enjoy the liberties which make every man want to live. So the problem facing the United States and the Western Hemisphere today is to determine the policy which will best tend to keep us at peace and at the same time do the most to preserve the liberties, freedom and democracy which we cherish so dearly.

As the best solution to this problem, we of the Affirmative submit "That the Lend-Lease Bill now before Congress should be immediately passed."

By way of clarification, the bill referred to is House Resolution 1776 which grants the President the power, among others, to lend and lease defense articles and the like to nations fighting totalitarianism. We feel

that this bill, as mentioned in the question, should be passed at once by Congress.

We of the Affirmative will establish two issues in this debate: First, there is a definite need for the passage of the Lend-Lease Bill, and second, passage of the Lend-Lease Bill will solve the problems created by the need. I shall establish the first issue and my colleague the second one.

There is a definite need to pass House Resolution 1776 because Britain is in part fighting our battle and needs all the aid which can be given her immediately. We need but refer to books like *The Voice of Destruction* (1940. 295 pp. Putnam.) written by the former President of the Danzig Senate, Herman Raushnigg, to realize that Hitler and Nazism have their eyes set upon the United States for a future field of operation after victory over Britain. In no better way can I drive home to you the truth of the matter than to use the words of Walter Darre, German Minister of Food and Agriculture, in an address in May, 1940: "We Germans have accounts which must be settled with this country (United States)," and further, "the United States also will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation."

When we face cold facts as presented recently by Secretary of the Navy Knox, we know that the victorious Axis would have a combined navy over twice the size of ours in 1942 as well as a ship-building capacity five to seven times greater than ours. The further information that the naval superiority will increase in the

future, makes us realize that a victorious Germany constitutes a definite threat to the United States.

Nor do we have to go far to learn that a Nazi dominated Europe would control $500,000,000 worth of South American exports. This would place Germany in the position of economic whip-cracker to force the road open to political domination of South American countries as was accomplished recently in the Balkans —thence attacks on the United States from South American bases.

These facts as well as assertions made in *Mein Kampf,* that Democracy and Nazism can never live side by side, all make us realize that truly today, Britain is fighting our battle and the United States must adopt a policy which offers her as much aid as possible without actually becoming involved.

The Lend-Lease Bill must be passed because Britain is in need of financial assistance in making purchases of war articles. From an estimated seven billion dollars of resources in the United States at the beginning of the war we learn from Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau that Britain has but $1,775,000,000 remaining to pay for existing orders amounting to three billion. Although her resources are dwindling fast, one need but look at her tremendous shipping losses to understand that her needs for assistance are greater than ever. Since Britain is helping to protect us, we should be willing to aid by lending and leasing materials to the bearer of the torch of freedom, instead of draining her to the hilt for dollars which she may soon not have anyhow. Furthermore, World War No. I taught us

that we could never expect repayment of dollar loans, in dollars; and that is why Congress passed the Cash-and-Carry Bill. Time and again though, our debtors offered to pay us in goods and materials. Let us face reality and formulate a policy which will give us a much better means of re-coupment later, and at the same time, will give substantial aid to the cause of Britain, Greece and China. If we must sacrifice a dollar for dollar repayment, remember Britain's immediate need of financial assistance and give it with visions of what the other democracies have suffered and are suffering under the mailed fist of oppression.

House Resolution 1776 concentrates power in the President to co-ordinate and speed up defense industries in uniform production of articles, and to apportion them as needed. This action is necessary rather than an extension of credit, because in the latter case the British purchasing mission would be bidding against the Greek, Chinese, and possibly Turkish missions. Under Lend-Lease however, there is no competition for materials; they are apportioned from industries co-ordinated and stepped up in production by the government. In the words used by the *United States News* of Feb. 7, 1941, "Through Lend-Lease, the United States can get the same drive behind her program of arming Britain and other anti-Axis countries that she could get if she were fighting." Speed is essential in aid to England, and House Resolution 1776 is necessary to speed up that aid.

As Spring and favorable weather approach, British shipping losses are mounting alarmingly and the threat

of invasion of the British Isles draws nigh. The Nazi airplane ratio still far exceeds the British. Britain needs more immediate assistance than the present policy offers. Senator Brown of Michigan on Feb. 27 ably told the Senate: "This bill goes further than existing law, and permits the President to transfer up to $1,300,000,000 of existing defense articles to Britain immediately. This is something tangible and very essential to Britain at this time. Therefore, to give Britain this immediate aid which she needs so desperately, it is necessary that Congress pass this bill at once."

In summation, we see that the United States is confronted with the problem of determining what is the best policy in order to avoid war and yet at the same time help preserve our democracy. We see that a victorious Axis constitutes a definite threat to the United States and Latin America, militarily. Therefore, it is necessary to pass the Lend-Lease Bill to give financial assistance to Britain to help bear part of the brunt of the battle which, if successful, will remove the military threat against the United States. It is necessary to speed up production, which can be accomplished through the Lend-Lease Bill, as well as prevent competition among the purchasing missions. Lastly, Britain needs immediate assistance to forestall invasion and Lend-Lease provides this.

There is one definite thought which I must leave with you. While House Resolution 1776 accomplishes its mission of aiding the fight against aggression, it is definitely not meant to lead us into war. The United States is worth infinitely more to England, at peace, if

we can produce unhindered all the supplies she needs, and that is what the Lend-Lease accomplishes. I can provide you with no more fitting ending than to quote you the statement prefixed to House Resolution 1776 by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "It is the considered view of your Committee, insofar as human minds can evaluate the situation, that the probable effect of the bill will be to keep us out of war rather than to get us into it. It is also the judgment of your Committee that the bill provides the most efficient way of supplying all possible material aid to those countries which are resisting aggression. It accomplishes this objective in a manner which is best for our national defense and wholly consistent with the Constitution and international law."

First Negative, Bill Glenn
University of Wichita

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Berkowitz and I fully appreciate the freedom and liberty of our country the same as our friends from Florida. We agree with Mr. Aronovitz that the problem facing the United States and Western Hemisphere today is to determine a foreign policy that will best tend to keep us at peace and at the same time do most to preserve the liberty, freedom, and democracy which we cherish so deeply.

However, we seriously disagree with their solution to this problem and we maintain that our Government should not adopt the Lend-Lease Bill; first, because

that very bill would destroy our liberty, freedom, and democracy by placing us under totalitarian rule, and second, it would involve us in a foreign war.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Aronovitz first told us that the Nazis were coming after us. He told us that they are looking toward our continent as a future field of operation. However, he gave us no proof for this fact, except that some German propagandists say they are coming. Now let us examine this argument and see if it is at all reasonable. We find it took Hitler eight years to get ready to invade England. And he is still unsuccessful after trying it for more than a year. If it took Hitler eight years to get ready to cross the Channel, and one year, or two years, or ten years, to cross the Channel, how long would it take him to reach the Hudson, Delaware, or the Potomac. No, he won't come here.

That is why Colonel Lindbergh said in the House of Representatives committee meeting, that it is impossible for any enemy to invade our shores; because first, a navy can not operate without bases close to the scene of operations; second, a navy operating across the Atlantic would lose over one-half to three-fourths of its effectiveness; and third, it is impossible for either Europe or America to invade the other country by air.

The idea that Hitler can attack our country is as impossible as thinking of a man with both arms tied behind him picking a fight with the heavy-weight champion, Joe Louis. Likewise, the argument that the Nazis are coming after us is so unreasonable that James M. Gillis, editor of *The Catholic World,* said,

"Only a simpleton in strategy could imagine Hitler's coming over here." And so my friends, let us not get jittery about the Nazis as we know they can never menace American shores.

The second point which Mr. Aronovitz has brought forth in this debate is that a victorious Axis with conquered navies would be twice the size of ours, and so our power on the seas would be threatened. However, this argument is weak because in the first place military authorities tell us that it would take a navy considerably more than twice the size of ours to menace our shores, operating from distant bases. But we must not let our friends of Florida misguide our thoughts by telling us that a victorious Axis would ever have so great a naval power because the British navy will never surrender. Mr. Churchill, himself, said, "Britannia rules the waves. When it became necessary the French Fleet got away. If it becomes necessary cannot the British Fleet get away? It's a wonder that alarmists do not begin to talk sense." Even a victorious Axis navy could no more menace our navy, than a sail boat would dare attack a destroyer.

Now may I refute the third point of the opposition which was that German penetration in South America is a threat to our welfare. Of course, if there were such a threat, it would be dangerous, but no such threat has, does, or will exist. Mr. Aronovitz attempted to make us believe that the Nazis were rapidly gaining control of South American exports. However, statistics from *Foreign Policy Reports* show us that the Nazis, before the World War II, controlled only 16%

of South America's trade, while the United States controls 31%. In other words, at that time Germany had less than half the economic control in South America that the United States had, and since the latest World War started, trade between Germany and South America has almost ceased, while trade between the United States and South America is on the increase. True, our friends from Florida might point out that the Nazis made some trade gains in South America before World War II started, but these gains represented only a normal return to her trading channels as they existed before the World War I. Germany's trade before the present war was less than one per cent more than in 1913. Furthermore, the United States does only 2% less trading with South America than Germany, England, France, Italy, and Japan combined. These statistics prove that as sure as there is a South America, Nazi economic control of that country is as negligible as a few heads of rye in a large wheat field. Today the United States is loaning millions to these neighbors of ours to stimulate their industries. That, plus our good neighbor policy, is sufficient to insure us against Nazi penetration.

We have examined Mr. Aronovitz's arguments one by one, and not a single one of his points shows that we really need this Lend-Lease Bill. We have seen that it would be impossible for the Nazis to invade the Western Hemisphere, either by land or by sea. Also, we have seen that it is foolish to fear the results of Nazi economic penetration in South America. But the

fact that we don't need the Lend-Lease Bill is not nearly as important as the fact that it would be extremely dangerous to adopt such a bill. So let's examine the bill a little more closely and see just what its effects on the United States would be.

Mr. Berkowitz and I fully realize the precarious situation that England is in today and we agree that the United States should aid her. But this aid should not come through the Lend-Lease Bill because the bill gives dictatorial powers to our President, thus adopting totalitarianism in our own country; and further it would involve our people in a most disastrous world war.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you are patriotic American citizens and no doubt a single reading of this bill would convince you that it would suspend the very essence of democratic government. Friends, when you stop to think that no King, no Premier, no South American President, nor Franco or Il Duce, or perhaps even the Fuehrer himself has such power as the original bill would grant our President, it seems very clear that we would be giving up our cherished rights of freedom and democracy to let Congress pass such an un-American bill.

We must remember that this is the President's own bill. It is what he wants. Therefore, it is the authentic revelation of his mind. Taking it from the bill, this seems to be what he wants:

POWER as he may see fit, to conduct undeclared war any place in the world.

POWER in his own discretion to employ the total resources of our country to make friends or enemies of other nations.

POWER to make military alliances; and to lend, lease, or give other governments any of the military resources of the United States.

POWER to make or edict such laws as he sees fit to carry out his own intentions.

POWER to command money in any amount to put his own ideas into effect.

These are the standard powers of a dictator. Never before in all our history has an executive sought and obtained in time of peace so nearly absolute powers as this bill would bestow upon Mr. Roosevelt. Ladies and Gentlemen, it seems foolishly wrong to kill democracy in the United States in the vain hope of establishing it "everywhere in the world."

This bill gives the President a blank check on the taxpayers' money to be used for defense of Britain or any other country without any safeguards or checks. Under this bill our President can give away our entire navy, army, or air force, except the men. Our President aims to use these powers, else he would not ask for them. You are the taxpayers. The army, navy, and air force, belong to you. Before you allow Congress to pass the Lend-Lease Bill you should thoroughly understand its effect upon you. Should one man be allowed to spend your money freely? Should one man control our total national defense? If you aim to keep

your liberties, freedom, and democracy, you must force Congress to kill the Lend-Lease Bill.

This bill cannot only be branded as totalitarian, but also as a war bill,—only Congress can legally declare war. Mr. Berkowitz and I believe that you should oppose any attempt to take that power from Congress as the Lend-Lease Bill would do. If the Lend-Lease Bill passes there is little need of Congress staying in session. If Congress passes this bill, it will have virtually voted itself out of existence and that does not lessen the shame. Years ago the Czar abolished the Duma and not so many years ago Hitler abolished the Reichstag. When this happened a great cry of consternation and contempt went up in this country and we said it could never happen here. But if Congress passes this bill it will happen even in the land of freedom and liberty.

That is why our own Senator Arthur Capper says, "This measure is a complete surrender of the responsibilities given to Congress by the Constitution and sets up a dictatorship for the President. It is a war bill transferring to the President war-making powers which undoubtedly belong to Congress and which he undoubtedly intends to use."

The fate of our hands is in this Congress. By its vote on this bill it will tell the President that he cannot dictate a war; or it will tell him that he can. It will tell him that if there is to be a war, the people through their legislative representatives will determine the time, place, and enemy; or it will abdicate in his favor, and

confess that we are already a dictatorship and that he is our Fuehrer.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we must remember that our Hemisphere is in no danger of attack from a foreign power, either militarily or economically. We must remember that only a simpleton in strategy could imagine the Nazis coming here. Friends, if you want to go on living in a democracy then the Lend-Lease Bill must be killed. If you do not want to have your sons killed on foreign battle fields, then you must force Congress to kill the Lend-Lease Bill.

This is why Mr. Berkowitz and I believe that as a solution to our national problem, the Lend-Lease Bill is extremely dangerous, and since we also realize that Great Britain needs our help, Mr. Berkowitz will show that we can aid Britain to the fullest extent, without sacrificing our democracy and our principles of liberty. Then, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us remember that the Lend-Lease Bill will make our President a dictator who can force us to go to war. He can form secret alliances that might entangle us in war, and he can spend our money without our consent. These are direct violations of democracy and so every red-blooded American citizen should place thumbs down on this totalitarian bill.

Second Affirmative, Hamilton Shaw Foster
University of Florida

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This debate at its present stage of development characterizes,

I feel, the all too prevalent tendency, of which we are all guilty at times, to over-simplify and over-generalize in dealing with a complex and complicated problem.

Problems such as the one now under discussion are by their very nature affected in their solution by a multiplicity of considerations and oftentimes opposing factors. No "cure-all" will ever be found in attempting to solve such complexly intertwined military, economic, and political situations. All that can be done in that respect is to settle on a policy which seems, under *all* the existing circumstances, most likely to achieve the desired result.

We of the Affirmative have not contended, and do not now contend that the Lend-Lease Bill will, of and by itself, prove to be a panacea for all the ills of this war-torn world; nor is it our purpose to pedantically ascribe to it some magic attribute guaranteed to keep us out of war, regardless of future developments. No prophet exists to our knowledge who can in these chaotic times say with any real degree of assurance what the ultimate outcome of the present wave of international gangsterism will be.

What we can do, and what we are attempting to do here in this discussion, is to analyze the problems with which we are now confronted as a peace and liberty loving democratic people, and to weigh the probabilities of any given course of action as dispassionately and objectively as we may in the light of such known facts and informed thought as are presently available to us.

No consideration of any projected action can be in-

telligently approached without first ascertaining its purposes—the goals it is designed to reach. What, then, are the policies House Resolution 1776—the Lend-Lease Bill—is designed to effectuate? I quote from the general statement filed by Senator George, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"It is the conviction of your committee . . . that the welfare of the United States can best be served by a foreign policy based, as it has always been, upon two fundamental principles. Those principles are:

First: The United States must strive in all ways reasonably possible to stay at peace with the world; and

Second: The United States must, in its own interests, supply effective material aid to those countries whose defense is vital to *our* defense."

We feel that our friends from Wichita will join with us in approving these fundamental principles as basically sound and largely indicative of the wishes of the American people as a nation. Mr. Glenn has so expressed our opinion in the able address he has delivered in behalf of the Negative.

My colleague and I seem, then, to be in accord with our friends and fellow Americans from Kansas, as well as with the eminent Senator from Georgia and his learned Foreign Relations Committee, on the basic and fundamental principles by which we should be guided in our attempt to reach as satisfactory a solution as may be possible for the problems which confront us. It is in the possible measures approaching

the attainment of this solution that the Negative parts company with us. Let me quote further from Senator George's statement:

"Your Committee believes that within the terms of House Resolution 1776, (the Lend-Lease Bill) as amended, provision is amply, safely and constitutionally made that the foreign policy of the United States shall continue to be guided by these two principles. . . . Your Committee wishes strongly to emphasize its considered conviction that House Resolution 1776 is not a war measure but a practical safeguard aimed at keeping us out of war."

The opinion just enunciated was not reached without deep and prayerful thought based on the most accurate and complete information and testimony available to anyone today; further, it is the considered opinion of eminently able men upon whose shoulders our Democracy has placed great responsibility and whose sincere devotion to the best interests of the nation cannot be doubted.

My colleague, Mr. Aronovitz, has shown you the reasons why we feel that there is an urgent present need for the passage of this measure. He has shown you the possible results of a British defeat at the hands of the Axis powers; the resulting military and naval threat that would inevitably hang over the Western Hemisphere therefrom; the incalculable economic threat to our security and that of our hemispheric neighbors that would be involved. He has done more than that. He has offered you the nearest thing to a solution of these problems—the nearest thing to a pos-

sible prevention of their eventuality—that has been as yet conceived by our students and experts in international affairs and by the leadership of our Democracy. In short, he has offered you the Lend-Lease Bill.

He has not championed this measure as a panacea that will cure all our ills, nor yet, as a palliative or temporizing step. It is a forceful active attempt to do what we may in molding our future destiny as a nation before we are ourselves actually drawn into a war—militarily or economically, or both—on the Dictators' terms in accord with their familiar divide-and-conquer technique.

I would that we of the Affirmative might feel the same sense of security apparently felt by Mr. Glenn and Mr. Berkowitz, for the present secure in their land-locked State of Kansas, but I fear that such a sense of security is purchased only by refusing to face fact, like the ostrich which buries its head in the sand rather than see approaching danger.

Mr. Glenn has unconcernedly turned aside my colleague's realistic picture of the dangers which confront us, apparently without any very clear appreciation of their factual basis and import.

For example, Mr. Glenn has cited Colonel Lindbergh and the editor of *The Catholic World* as his authority for asserting the impregnability of the United States. Flying the Atlantic alone showed that the Colonel was a good solo pilot, but neither that feat, nor his marrying an ambassador's daughter, or his wearing a German decoration presented to him by Herr Hitler would seem to make Lindbergh an authority omniscient in all

things however foreign to his own training and experience. Nor does it seem that editing a religious periodical qualifies a man as an authority capable of branding really expert sources "simpletons in strategy," —yet that is the import of Mr. Glenn's argument.

The Committee on Naval Affairs of the United States Senate is made up of men who have given long and serious study to the navy and to national defense, and they have been privileged to enjoy the benefit of the best-trained minds on this subject in the world. Here is what was recently reported by that Committee:

"From all the evidence available, it appears that the United States can be conquered without military conquest of continental United States. An effective blockade against our foreign commerce can be maintained at points thousands of miles from our coasts and well beyond aircraft range. Our outlying possessions will be captured and used against us as advance bases. There will be nothing to prevent the establishment of bases, by force, if necessary, in this hemisphere, from which, as well as from aircraft carriers, repeated bombing raids can be dispatched against our highly industrialized areas."

Perhaps that is an extreme view, but it is certainly entertained by men in positions to judge.

Mr. Glenn further minimizes the naval threat in an Axis victory thus, "Even a victorious Axis navy could no more menace our navy than a sailboat would dare attack a destroyer."

This statement is so fallacious on its very face that it seems a pity to have to give it the dignity of serious

consideration that might be implied from a reply. Its utter lack of realism should have been apparent from the statistics we have already quoted from Secretary of the Navy Knox even to the proponents of the Negative.

Mr. Knox's report to Congress showed that the combined fleets of Germany, Italy, and Japan alone are at present twice as strong as the United States Navy (the strength Mr. Glenn himself says would be required to defeat us!). Further, it was reported that this situation will grow worse under present building programs with the war fleets under Hitler's control growing much faster than are our own.

Might I further point out that this report does not take into account the remaining force of the French Navy, the disposition of which remains uncertain, nor the British Battle Fleet, which might conceivably fall into Axis hands, and that Mr. Knox flatly stated that in his opinion Great Britain's Navy could survive only if the British Isles survived, for if they fall "the British Navy, which never runs from danger, will fall at the same time."

Typical of the Negative's unwillingness to face all the facts are their statistics on pre-war German trade with South America. They adopt figures on the trade of Germany *alone* with these Latin Nations, taken at a time when the German industrial system was bent on a super-human effort to create primarily a vast war machine. They ignore the almost limitless potentialities of that state-controlled industrial system once it is turned in full into the channels of international commerce and trade. Far worse, they ignore the tremen-

dous difference between Germany *alone* and the *Nazi dominated European Continent* that will surely emerge with an Axis victory.

I quote again from Mr. Glenn: "Mr. Berkowitz and I fully realize the precarious situation that England is in today and we agree that the United States should aid her. But this aid should not come through the Lend-Lease Bill because the bill gives dictatorial powers to our President . . . it would involve our people in a most disastrous world war."

Ladies and Gentlemen, I submit to you that in one statement our friends from Wichita have tacitly admitted that their position is in reality an untenable one.

They seem to imply that taking every necessary precaution to defend one's own land and ideals is an act of war. They admit that Britain must have our help, but offer no solution of their own, unless we may infer that they recommend a declaration of war itself in rejecting our alternative—the Lend-Lease Bill.

They cry "dictatorship" in the face of the fact that Congressional controls are provided in the power to withdraw the authorization by joint resolution and in the inherent power of withholding appropriations thereunder. This charge is further in the face of the Gallup poll results showing that 70 per cent of the people hold the view that, "Sending war materials to England is helping to keep us out of war, because, if Britain can keep Germany in check, there is less chance that we will have to fight the Germans later on."

Yes, the Negative says it is dictatorship for the President to ask the approval of our representatives

in Congress before he takes actions many of which he could take even without that approval, as constitutional commander-in-chief of our armed forces. That is real democracy in action—not dictatorship!

Perhaps, good Americans though they are, the Negative have come to lose faith in the democratic process along with Mr. Lindbergh whom they quote.

At any rate, we of the Affirmative believe that the time is at hand when America, as the greatest democracy the world has ever known, must awaken to an alert realization of her manifest duty in a world in which totalitarianism has made a mockery of the basic tenets of human freedom and Christian brotherhood.

Realistic neutrality as embodied in the Lend-Lease Bill will, we feel, give us the opportunity to vindicate democracy in a *democratic* way.

Second Negative, Bill Berkowitz
University of Wichita

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You will remember that Mr. Glenn took up each of the arguments advanced by the first gentleman from Florida, point by point, as he made them and showed that we could not agree that the Lend-Lease Bill should be passed. Then he went on to show the grave dangers embodied in the bill—put there deliberately, we think, by a Democratic Party which has gone insane with power. He showed you that in the opinion of thinking men the bill uselessly gives to the President of the

United States greater power than any other ruler in the world, unless that ruler be Hitler himself.

Now, what has Mr. Foster had to say against the points made by Mr. Glenn? Let us examine the second Affirmative speaker's arguments as we have examined those of the first speaker—point by point in the order in which they were made.

First of all, Mr. Foster confessed that he did not believe the Lend-Lease Bill a "cure-all." Well and good. We go further. We believe it a mere cloak for the granting of dictatorial powers to the President. So his first point does not in any way prove we should adopt the bill.

Second, Mr. Foster explained again that the goals of the bill are claimed to be: first, to keep the United States at peace; second, to supply material aid to countries whose defense is vital to our own. At least, Mr. Foster told us that Senator George *thought* these two things essential in our foreign policy. Again, well and good. But, by no stretch of the imagination can it be argued that the Lend-Lease Bill is an instrument of peace. And a reading of the bill will show that it does not aid any country—*unless the President sees fit*. The bill is not a bill to help England—it is a bill to give the President the power to decide whether *he* wants to help England or not. So the bill does not fit the second part of Senator George's two fundamentals of good foreign policy. And Mr. Foster's quoting of Senator George in no way proves that the Lend-Lease Bill should be adopted.

Third, Mr. Foster again quoted Senator George, a

Democrat, saying that he and his committee believed that the Lend-Lease Bill upheld the two principles just laid down. But please note that even Senator George could see that this was open to question. He felt that the bill needed defense, and he argued that it would not take us into war.

Now in answer to Senator George's statement, Senator Capper, Colonel Lindbergh and a great number of other patriotic men, point out two things: First, they point out that if we really wish to aid England, China, and like counries, we don't need to pass a measure like the Lend-Lease Bill. We need merely to have Congress, the proper authority, vote to send specific aid. Second, they point out that the bill grants such wide powers to one man that its effect will be the opposite to peace and security.

The bill makes it possible for one man to give away every defense weapon we have. The bill makes it possible for one man's judgment to carry the burden of deciding upon war or peace. The bill makes it possible for the error of judgment of one man to plunge this country into war after it has been stripped of its defenses. We do not maintain that the President *plans* to strip this country of its defenses; we assume his purpose to be high and noble. We do not doubt from all that he has said and done that he *believes* himself to be more capable and intelligent and free from errors than any other human being who ever lived. We assume that he believes that he can wield this power for the good of the country. But we join the many opponents of the bill in believing the President wrong in this

matter. This, then, is our second answer to Senator George's hope that the bill will not lead us into difficulties. And until Mr. Foster can offer more than a single quotation from the mouth of one of the bill's chief sponsors, he cannot allay our fears.

Fourth, Mr. Foster attacked Colonel Lindbergh as merely a pilot who flew the Atlantic, and not capable of judging the country's defense forces. But Mr. Foster forgets that the national Administration thought enough of Mr. Lindbergh's judgment to call him from England to report on his analysis of German, Russian and British strength. And Mr. Foster forgets that the master military genius, Hitler, thought enough of Lindbergh's judgment and ability to have him examine German national defense. And Mr. Foster forgets that President Roosevelt personally asked Mr. Lindbergh to check over our own air defense not so many years ago. The *real* reason people attack Lindbergh today is not because they believe him incompetent—every one of his opponents has admitted Lindbergh's authority at one time or another. The real reason is that he is attacking them, and his testimony is damaging. The administration and the gentlemen from Florida seem to heed the old sophist's advice: "When you can't attack their evidence, attack their character." We ask Mr. Foster to explain away all the international recognition of Lindbergh as an authority, before his conclusions became unpopular—and until Mr. Foster does this, we must ignore his attack of Mr. Glenn's point.

Fifth, Mr. Foster quoted the Committee on Naval Affairs to the effect that the United States might be con-

quered by having its foreign trade taken from it. Now two things are noteworthy here. First, even the Committee on Naval Affairs did not argue with Mr. Foster that Germany could possibly get a navy large enough to defeat our own and attack this country. Instead, the Committee talked of loss of foreign trade, and of long distance airplanes dropping bombs on our cities. So Mr. Foster's quotation does not prove the point the Affirmative were making. Second, the statement of the Committee was made on the assumption that this country depends upon foreign trade with other hemispheres. This last war has proved this thesis to be wrong—since the time that the Committee on Foreign Affairs made its famous statement. President Roosevelt at one stroke of the pen—and we think wisely—threw away our foreign trade with other hemispheres, by making it impossible for American ships to go into war zones. The restriction has been operating for about a year and a half—has this country gone bankrupt, has it been conquered? Not a bit of it. We have learned that foreign trade—that is, trade with Europe and the Orient, is not as important as we'd always believed. And it is highly probable, in the face of the acid test of trial, that the Committee on Naval Affairs will be forced to admit that it was wrong—that the United States cannot be conquered by cutting off our foreign trade.

Next, Mr. Foster attacked Mr. Glenn's statistics, proving that Germany has not gained strength in South American trade. Mr. Foster thinks Germany will gain, even though it has not yet done so. Now, that is a

point on which we disagree, and only time will give the answer. It has nothing to do with this debate, and it proves in no way that the Lend-Lease Bill should be passed.

Finally, Mr. Foster claims that merely giving the President (I quote) "the powers he asks" is not dictatorship. Yet he found no time to answer the specific charges made by Mr. Glenn. Mr. Foster *knows* that the bill does give to a single man the following powers:

1. Power, as he sees fit, to conduct undeclared war anywhere in the world.
2. Power, at his own discretion, to employ the total resources of our country to make friends or enemies of other nations.
3. Power, to make military alliances and to lend, lease, or give to any other government any or all of our defense weapons—one man's judgment as to whether we give or keep our fleet, our airplanes, our guns, and our ammunition.
4. Power, to make such laws (edicts they will be called) as he personally believes necessary to carry out *his own* intentions.
5. Power, to command money in any amount to put his own ideas into effect.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you what other power would a man need to make him a dictator? Can you think of a single power that is lacking? These are the specific charges opponents of the bill have always made—and never have they been answered. They

cannot be answered. For they are the powers granted by the bill now before Congress.

In the final analysis, not many Americans are against giving material aid to England, so long as it doesn't involve us in war or weaken our defenses. Senator Capper, Lindbergh, and all the rest of us who fight the Lend-Lease Bill are sympathetic to the British and the Chinese. But I ask again, as Senator Capper has asked so often, "Why must the President be granted all these powers merely so that we can send food and war materials to England? *Why* must these blanket powers be granted? *Why* doesn't the President tell *Congress* what England needs and what we can spare? *Why* doesn't the President ask *Congress* to use the powers it has to get aid to Britain, if Britain needs aid so badly? Opponents of the Lend-Lease Bill have long asked these questions. But the President has been strangely quiet. Like the gentlemen from Florida, he talks of Britain's needs, of our dependence on the British Fleet, of the danger to America if Germany wins. Yet like the gentlemen, the President never says anything about the Lend-Lease Bill. Again we challenge the Affirmative to explain *why* this bill with all its blanket grants of power, must be passed? Why cannot we aid Britain in the time-honored, democratic, American way—the way in which we've aided other countries for 150 years—by having Congress make specific grants?

Ladies and Gentlemen, if England needs help and the American people want to help her, let them do it through their properly appointed representatives—

don't pass the Lend-Lease Bill. We fear this bill. We fear the idea behind its conception. We fear that no man's judgment or intelligence is great enough to carry the responsibility the bill imposes. It isn't needed. We can aid Britain without it. It is dangerous. We challenge the Affirmative to take up the specific charges we have made and show that the bill is not dangerous. Until they do, we must conclude that common sense tells us we should not pass a dangerous bill that is not needed.

In this debate, Mr. Glenn and I have shown that the Lend-Lease Bill is not needed and that it is highly dangerous. Neither of these charges has been specifically denied. On the other hand, we have examined every point made by the Affirmative team in the order they were given and have shown you why we cannot agree. Until they can show us that the Lend-Lease Bill provides something that we need and cannot get in any other way; until they show us that it is not dangerous; until they can point out that it is the best possible method of getting aid to Britain, we must insist, along with the vast majority of Americans that the Lend-Lease Bill is rank folly, highly dangerous, and should not be adopted.

Affirmative Rejoinder, Sidney Aronovitz
University of Florida

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If the gentlemen from Kansas can take time out for a moment from debating whether or not the "Lone Eagle"

is a competent authority on international affairs, they will perhaps realize how feeble their attacks on the Lend-Lease Bill are—especially the attacks on the powers supposedly conferred upon the President.

In the first place, every President of the United States has always been Commander-in-Chief of our armed forces, and has been able to deploy any branch of it as he sees fit. Just as President Polk ordered General Zachary Taylor to cross the Rio Grande and brought about an armed clash which resulted in a declaration of war on Mexico; just as President Wilson ordered General Pershing and a detachment of our army many miles into Mexico to catch Pancho Villa; just as President Wilson finally ordered the arming of American merchant ships after the Senate had killed such a measure,—so can President Roosevelt at any time order armed forces to convoy ships into the war zones, to seize Martinique, the Azores, or Greenland. In other words, the President already has the constitutional power which allows him, if he desires, "to create incidents" which could draw us into war; he doesn't need the Lend-Lease Bill to obtain it. The Negative side also overlooks the fact that today the President can make use of executive agreements to conclude many accords which the Negative claims he could make only by virtue of powers granted by this measure. He can by an executive agreement with the British obtain the use of Singapore as a base for our Pacific fleet—without awaiting the grace of H.R. 1776.

The gentlemen are even more worried that the bill gives the President the power "to command money."

Once again they fail to consider that this bill which we ask Congress to adopt provides that the President must ask Congress for appropriations from time to time. Here again, a Congressional check makes a power of the President, which the gentlemen from Kansas point to with horror, a mere nightmare in their own minds.

We are asked why the President doesn't tell Congress exactly what England's needs are. That is exactly why he advanced this measure. According to Mr. Glenn the President wants these powers and that's why he advanced the bill. The reasoning exhibited here fails to consider that if Congress were to vote credits for England, to be converted into material in the United States, it would still have to submit the gearing of industry for speedy production to a directory and executory branch—the President. Mr. Glenn and Mr. Berkowitz have not told us how by their plan—other than lending or leasing—the same steps would not have to be taken and the same powers would not have to be conferred upon the President in order to accomplish the same results.

So we see then that the same Hitlerian power which H.R. 1776 supposedly conveys on the President, are "horrors" which exist at the present time, would exist under their plan, and yet we are still living in a democracy under democratic President Roosevelt.

In brief recapitulation, we see that while the Negative side objects to the Reich Minister of Agriculture as a source of authority for a veiled threat to America, they glibly offer Colonel Lindbergh and the Editor of the *Catholic World* to decry the Senate Naval Affairs

Committee's report on the vulnerability of the Western Hemisphere to attack. Well, for even more substantial proof let us refer to the February 14 issue of the *United States News*, "Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson both have said that this country will be in jeopardy if the British Navy is captured or destroyed. General Marshall and Admiral Starke hold similar views.

The gentlemen themselves admit that a navy twice the size of ours would constitute a threat to the Western Hemisphere, and yet they overlooked Secretary Knox's statistics showing the possibility of such a fleet, in the event of an Axis victory.

In response to the threat of a Hitler-dominated Europe dictating terms of trade to South American countries which are absolutely dependent upon Europe for export of their surpluses, the gentlemen of the opposition evaded the issue by saying that United States trade in Latin America is gaining. Nevertheless, it doesn't alter the complete dependency of Latin America on Europe, which fact would allow the Axis to exert pressure in bargaining.

We pointed out that because these dangers exist, the United States should aid England in fighting "our battle." Britain needs immediate aid to forestall an invasion, and Lend-Lease provides that up to $1,300,000,000 of our existing defense articles. The opposition countered by saying that this would strip us of our defenses, obviously overlooking the limitation of $1,300,000,000 placed upon the amount of articles which can be sent.

In conclusion, let us say that in a time of such na-

tional emergency "only a simpleton in strategy" would assert that any President, Democrat or Republican, would seek powers to jeopardize the safety of his own country and his own people by flaunting them carelessly to the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

LEND-LEASE BILL

Business Week.—January 18, 1941, p. 15. *America's New Deal for Britain.* March 15, 1941, pp. 15-16. *Business Goes to War.*

Catholic World.—152:641-50, March, 1941. *All-Out-Aid-for-Britain.* J. M. Gillis. 153:1-4, 73-82, April, 1941. *Discussion.* 152:748-50, March, 1941. *Complete Text of H.R. 1776.*

Christian Century.—58:212, February 12, 1941. *Debate on Lend-Lease Bill.* 58:385-7, March 19, 1941. *New Battlegrounds; Powers of the President.* 58:113-114, January 22, 1941. *No Compromise!* 58:347, March 12, 1941. *Public Begins to Awaken.* 58:173, February 5, 1941. *Revealing the Heart of the Lend-Lease Bill.* 58:447-9, April 2, 1941. *Toward National Socialism; Political Consequences of the Lend-Lease Bill.*

Collier's.—107:70, February 22, 1941. *H.R. 1776.*

Commonweal.—33:531-2, March 21, 1941. *Arsenal of Democracy.* 33:507-8, March 14, 1941. *Mandate for Purposes Unknown.* 33:436-7, February 21, 1941. *Policy and Action.* 33:421-2, February 14, 1941. *Views and Reviews; Joint Letter to Senator George.* M. Williams.

Congressional Digest.—20:97-8, April, 1941. *Congress Approves All-Out Aid for Great Britain.* 20:35-6, February, 1941. *Highly Controversial Lend-Lease Bill.*

Current History.—52:7-9, February 13, 1941. *House Bill 1776.* 52:36, March, 1941. *H.R. 1776, Pro and Con.*

Fortune.—23:74-5, April, 1941. *Lend-Lease and the Legislative Process.*

International Conciliation.—369:529-32, April, 1941. *Act to Promote the Defense of the U.S.: Public Law 11, 77th Congress, H.R. 1776: Text.*

Life.—10:24, January 27, 1941. *Administrative Big Guns Go Into Action for H. R. 1776.* 10:17-19, February 3, 1941. *Congressmen Haggle Over Lend-Lease Bill.*

Nation.—152:172, February 15, 1941. *H.R. 1776.* 152:89-90, January 25, 1941. *Loyal Opposition.* 152:91-2, January 25, 1941. *Time for Candor.* 152:287-8, March 15, 1941. *Wheeler's Clivedon Set.*

Nation's Business.—29:13, March 1941. *To Keep the Record Straight.*

New Republic.—104:69-70, January 20, 1941. *Battle of 1776.* 104: 325-6, March 10, 1941. *Democracy and Filibuster.* 104:358, March 17, 1941. *Does it Mean War?* 104:178, February 10, 1941. *FDR Outflanks 'em.* 104:103-4, January 27, 1941. *Is Lend-Lease a Step to War?* 104:99, January 27, 1941. *Republicans Wrecked.* 104:166, February 10, 1941. *Lend-Lease Revisions.*

Newsweek.—17:72, March 24, 1941. *After the Decision.* 17:13-16, February 10, 1941. *Backers of Lend-Lease Win First Round in Congress.* 17:15-17, January 20, 1941. *Bill That Would Give the President Power for All-out Aid.* 17:15-17, March 10, 1941. *British-Aid Stockpile Shaped as Lend-Lease Oratory Rages.* 17:-13-15, February 3, 1941. *Debate on Lend-Lease Measure Boosts Chances of Compromise.* 17:17-19, March 17, 1941. *Democracy's Arsenal Unlocked as Congress Hands Key to FDR.* 17:64, January 20, 1941. *H.R. 1776.* 17:72, February 24, 1941. *Lend-Lease Amendments.* 17:18-20, February 24, 1941. *Peace Aims.*

Saturday Evening Post.—213:26, February 15, 1941. *Behold! The Brass Serpent.*

Scholastic.—38:2, January 27; 2, February 3; 2, February 10; 2, February 24; 2, March 3; 2, March 10; 2, March 17; 2, March 24, 1941. *H.R. 1776.* 38:5-6, March 17, 1941. *H.R. 1776 Makes U.S. Arsenal of Democracy.* 38:7, February 3, 1941. *Today's Events in the Light of History.*

School and Society.—53:142-3, February 1, 1941. *Three-sided Controversy on AID to Britain; Chicago University Professors, Dr. Hutchins, Lindbergh.*

Scribner's Commentator.—9:7-10, April, 1941. *Nye vs. Morgenthau; Congressional Hearings on the Lend-Lease Bill.* 9:69-74, February, 1941. *Time to Think American; We Are Putting the Welfare of Other Countries Ahead of Our Own.* A. Capper.

Time.—37:16, March 3, 1941. *In Togas Clad.* 37:12-14, January 27,

1941. *Matter of Faith, Hearings Before House Foreign Affairs Committee.* 37:14, March 10, 1941. *Peacemongers.* 37:20, March 17, 1941. *Step in the Dark.* 37:13-16, January 20, 1941. *Three Views.* 37:16-18, February 24, 1941. *Undefeated. Willkie at Hearing.* 37:13, February 3, 1941. *Voices on 1776.* 36:26, March 24, 1941. *World and H.R. 1776.*

Vital Speeches.—7:267-8, February 15, 1941. *By Aiding Britain We Aid Ourselves.* 7:247-9, February 1, 1941. *Defense of the United States.* 7:293-6, March 1, 1941. *Let Us Keep Out of Foreign Wars; Kill the Lease-Lend Bill.* A. Capper. 7:299-300, March 1, 1941. *National Self-Preservation.* 7:290, March, 1941. *Pass the Lease-Lend Bill.* 7:249-50, February 1, 1941. *Warning on Isolation.* 7:266-7, February 15, 1941. *We Are Not Prepared for War.* C. A. Lindbergh.

UNION FOR DEFENSE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Women's Championship Debate, Phi Rho Pi National Convention

WEBER COLLEGE AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* VIRGINIA INTERMONT NEGATIVE

At the Phi Rho Pi National Tournament held at Charlotte, Virginia, the teams from Weber College of Ogden, Utah and of Virginia Intermont, Bristol, Virginia met in the finals of the Women's Division. The Negative team from Virginia Intermont won the debate thus taking first place and the Weber College team was ranked second. About 40 junior colleges sent teams to this meet, which was held April 6-10, 1941. The National Collegiate debate subject or the Pi Kappa Delta subject (as the two were the same) was the subject used in this tournament. The 1940-41 debate subject was stated: *Resolved, that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should enter into a permanent union.*

The speeches given here were obtained from the coaches of debate at Weber College, Prof. Leland H. Monson, and at Virginia Intermont, Prof. Leslie L. Thomason, through the co-operation of Miss Sylvia D. Mariner, National Secretary of Phi Rho Pi.

This debate illustrates a general tendency in the discussion of the National Collegiate Question throughout the country, namely to discuss it almost entirely from the economic point of view, rather than from the political and the military phases which were equally as important if less satisfactory for debating purposes.

UNION FOR DEFENSE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

First Affirmative, Camille Larsen
Weber College

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: For the past year and a half a great orgy of military conflagration and want and destruction has swept over Europe. Powerful nations have engulfed smaller ones. Now it seems as if the whole of Europe shall be dominated by one or two large powers. With these conditions, the nations of North and South America are facing an antagonistic world. Attention naturally centers around the situation and the measures which will be taken by these two continents. We are debating today, a question involving the status in action of the entire Western Hemisphere. This question is: Resolved, that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should form a permanent Pan-American union. We should like to define the terms. "Nations of the Western Hemisphere" means all nations included in our Pan-American Union now with the addition of Canada. "Should form" means that it would be desirable to establish. "Permanent" means everlasting, not just for the duration of the present war. "Union" means a compact body with powers to suggest and enforce all economic measures which may be deemed advisable for the welfare of the Western Hemisphere.

When the cave man made the first swap of skins for shells, trade between mankind was begun. Since then world trade has expanded until today the commercial enterprise of a nation may spell prosperity or chaos.

A glance at the map of Europe shows the nations in the Central and Southern parts under Nazi domination, economically as well as militarily. The basis for Nazi economic expansion was laid prior to Hitler and following the collapse of the gold reichsmark. Hitler needed but to harness this improved organization to the purposes of the national state. Because of various forms of pressure Hitler and company devised new methods of exchange and new currencies. The Nazi exchange control with Aski marks as its currency was then organized. This Nazi exchange control has the following characteristics as found in the November 1939 *Contemporary Review* (156:541 Economic Future of Germany), in an article by M. J. Bonn.

1. It enables her government to control the entry and the exit of all goods, services, and claims; and to develop by and by a complete system of supervision of all business, which is in any way directly or indirectly connected with foreign countries.

2. It isolates Germany and the German price level from external markets and foreign price levels, while her government can at the same time keep up such contacts abroad as it considers desirable.

3. It secures foreign markets for it by sale of blocked marks, which are of little value in international trade, but retain their full purchasing power in the German markets. Many countries were compelled to become Germany's unwilling creditors, since their claims could not be settled ex-

cept by the purchase of German goods, whenever they were available.

The Muscovy Empire or the Soviet Union follows a policy of conservation and self-sufficiency. Outlining and carrying out its Five Year Plans has made Russia a great economic nation. Her trade might be inconsequential but it has created a threat in more powerful quarters, for Germany has been forced by the Soviet Union to find a way to beat her game. In 1934 the Soviet Union took complete control of the agricultural products and enterprise. An example of her power and far reaching policy was the dumping of Ukraine wheat upon the world market for fifty cents a bushel. Such government regulation formed an economic wedge which cut down world-wide competition.

The nations of the Far East have long been considered great economic nations, but the shuffling oriental of yesterday is being replaced by a generation patterned after that of Europe. Economic controls have been expanded and increased since 1921, and in 1935 the Department of Foreign Affairs approved a ten year plan for the development of Formosa which was aimed at the intensification of trade relations. Immediately a large naval and air base was built there. Southeastern Asia offers Japan a good opportunity for quick economic returns. The world is beginning to realize that Tokyo already has a definite and ever increasing foothold in the South Seas area. She has a good-sized interest in twenty major enterprises in this area, including three in the Philippine Islands.

There is still a large group of nations outside the

Western Hemisphere which we have not examined. These are the countries controlled by the queen of the seas, England. Great Britain is not often thought of as a great economic nation using strict economic tactics; but we find that in desperation, production and trade decline, England has turned increasingly to the Empire as a market and a source of supply. Extensive controls have been instituted over the Empire industries, and in 1932 the Ottawa Conference took the first decisive step to make the whole Empire over into a closed door system. A dozen bilateral treaties of the sort for which later we so denounced Germany, were signed. One by one the Empire doors were quietly and slowly closed, and means to enforce the "Buy British" were set up.

Carleton Beals in his book, *Pan-America* points out a new device now in general use, that of clearing agreements. "These put pressure on weaker countries to barter to the advantage of the British Empire. They force acceptance of blocked sterling, which cannot be converted into gold or foreign exchange, but can be used only for re-purchases of goods made in the Empire by British labor and from only British raw materials. The seller takes all the risk of sterling depreciation and gets no benefit from increase in commodity prices, although he must pay mounting British prices.

"This is the Aski mark dressed up in a top-hat and speaking with an Oxford accent, but introducing a system actually more oppressive and less fluid than the Nazi trade system."

We have now examined all nations or groups of nations outside of the Western Hemisphere and have found that they are gradually consolidating their economic resources—that individualism is being replaced by controlled economies.

The Western Hemisphere with its vast economic resources and unlimited supplies of strategic materials form an easy target for these economies. This is true because of two reasons:

1. Individual enterprise mitigates against diversification. We find proof of this when we see that coffee and cotton represent 63 per cent of Brazil's export values; sugar alone, represents 82 per cent of Cuba's export values; petroleum and metals represent 75.7 per cent of Peru's exports. These are just a few examples, but they do show that the economy of the Latin American countries is based upon one commodity.
2. The second reason why the Western Hemisphere forms an easy target for controlled economies is because all the nations must deal individually in both buying and selling. In other words individualism is being pitted against controlled economies.

At the present time the nations of Europe are engaged in a great war. This war will not continue forever. After the war we will have a long period of readjustment followed by years of competition for world markets. The question is, are we prepared to cope with these controlled economies? We of the Affirmative feel that we are not.

In summary, then, we have pointed out, first, that the nations outside of the Western Hemisphere are consolidating their economic resources; and second, the

nations of the Western Hemisphere are not prepared to cope with these economies. Because of these conclusions we believe we are justified in saying there is need for a change.

First Negative, Marjory Rosen
Virginia Intermont

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Affirmative speaker has spent the major part of her time in a general summary of the economies existing throughout the world—namely, economic blocks using barter systems under various names. These she sets up as a grave threat to the Western Hemisphere with which we are unable to cope. Let us take notice of the very significant fact that these were described in general terms only, and not once did she show wherein the present system fails to meet our economic needs. Not once did she give us a plan by which the Affirmative proposes to solve those threats which are assumed, but which are not proved.

The Affirmative is proposing that the nations of the Western Hemisphere enter into a permanent union, for all time, in order to solve an indefinitely stated need which allegedly grows out of the fact that at the present time certain nations have modified their economic structures due to the war and other external causes. They propose that we turn from our present policy to a permanent union, because other nations have seen fit to barter and to turn to governmentally con-

:rolled and dominated schemes of production and ex-
:hange.

Before we of the Negative can accept the proposal, :he Affirmative must show us in what ways we are ɔeing threatened; how our present system is failing to ɜerve our needs; and that the union will meet our prob-.ems. With the first speaker's closing indictment in nind, "the nations of the western hemisphere are not ɔrepared to cope with these economies," let us ex-ɜmine the facts.

Our system is a growing, living foreign policy, adapt-ɜble to meet changing economic conditions. It has :aken cognizance of the so-called blocks of Europe and Asia through a quasi-economic block based on co-ɔperation. Pan Americanism, as stated by John I. B. McColloch, in *Challenge to the Americas,* "has become ɜ reality." As other nations modified their systems ɜnd policies, so have we modified and adapted ours with a real, workable plan. To meet our needs we have ɔome closer together, as evidenced by the sweeping ɜction of the Act of Havana.

The Affirmative say that we are not prepared to cope with economic conditions abroad. Let us examine the records and see what has been done. If our policy ɜerves our purpose, then the plea for a permanent union must fail. Since the opposition has mentioned the present war and anticipated the problems after the war, let us consider what has been and what is being done in light of both emergency and long range aspects. The following steps have been taken:

1. Imports from Latin America to the United States

have been stimulated for the purpose of developing dollar exchange. The United States Council of National Defense, in co-operation with the National Defense Advisory Commission, is directing its attentions toward necessary commodities needed for our defense.

2. The Export-Import Bank is co-operating with the Departments of State and Treasury in making loans to tide Latin America over the exchange deficiency caused by the war.

3. The Priority Board has given full attention to the needs of Latin America as regards essential goods from the United States and is helping control export prices.

4. Along with the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department, the office of the co-ordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations is maintaining adequate shipping facilities at a nominal cost.

5. The office of the Co-ordinator, with co-operation from the State and Commercial Departments, is eliminating conditions inimical to the interests of the hemisphere.

6. Merchandising studies of the Latin American markets are being executed by the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

7. An agency for supplying markets counsel to merchants in Inter-American trade has been set up.

On the long term front, the Export-Import Bank is working and the Inter-American Development Commission has established representative councils of leading business and financial experts in Latin America. This is an actual outgrowth of the Inter-American Fi-

nancial and Economic Advisory Committee. We are acting today under the present system. We are cooperating. What more can the Affirmative do under the proposed union than is already being done? Why have a permanent union of the nations of the Western Hemisphere if the present policy is meeting our economic needs?

Recalling the statement of the lady of the opposition we find that she gave two reasons why we are, quote, "an easy target for these (European) economies." First, most Latin American nations are one commodity economies; and secondly, we must deal as individual nations with the world. Let us consider these objections to the present system.

True, most Latin American nations have a leading product. In as much as possible, this is being dealt with through the Inter-American Development Commission. But such a program of diversification must come through gradual steps whether by our plan or by any other conceivable plan. And the opposition must show that a union would change the geographic and climatic conditions of Latin America before we can accept the premise that the union could do any more with the problem than is being done. We cannot overlook the fact that all nations produce those products in which they have a comparative cost advantage. The economic law must be disposed of before any plan can be set up as a solution for the problem of diversification. In other words, it is easy to say that Latin America should produce other products but it is as difficult a task as to force the wheat growers of Kansas

to become manufacturers of heavy industrial tools by signing a piece of paper. Argentina could not produce nitrates because she does not have the resources; Bolivia could not be called upon to produce sea foods because she does not have the sea. Nature dictates the products of a nation and no union can change the course.

Now let us consider the second reason given why we are an easy target for old world economies—the fact that individual nations must deal with foreign blocks. The Affirmative statement leads us to believe that the nations, as nations, deal individually in foreign trade, which is not the case. In Latin America, as in the United States, individual firms buy and sell on the open market. The nations, as such, do not carry on the trade. So all firms, as individuals compete. To provide a block, the Affirmative proposes a union. In the United States we have the most perfect union of the world, yet our firms still buy and sell as individuals. How does the Affirmative propose to eliminate competition of individual nations under their plan when it is not the nation but the individual firm that competes with other firms? Would their union eliminate competition any more than our union which encourages rather than stifles competition?

In June, 1940, we talked of a cartel—a joint agency, much like the proposal of the opposition. But notice that no mention of a union was made as a necessary element in setting up such a cartel. The plan, however, was not even brought up formally at Havana because of opposition by most of the nations concerned.

The disadvantages of such a program are well pointed out by Mr. McCulloch as "practical obstacles." He lists in his *Challenge to the Americas,* the prohibitive expense that would have to be borne by the United States, the unwieldy nature of the plan, and the fact that such a plan would call for complete regimentation.

We have the most desired answer to the question of individualism versus controlled economy in our present policy of co-operation. If a union were instituted to dictate the action of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, what would force the countries to deal collectively if individual interests dictated that they deal individually? Will a hemispherical police force wage civil war to force adherence to the plan? How is the plan to work? Until the opposition shows definitely that there is a threat; until it states what the threat is; until it proves that co-operation has failed; until it tells us what the proposed plan of union actually is and how it will work, we say that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should not form a permanent union.

Second Affirmative, Betty Lou Balch
Weber College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My colleague, Miss Larsen, has shown you the need for a change from the present policy because the world is revolving into controlled economies and the *status quo* is incapable of meeting these problems. I should like to submit additional reasons why we of the Affirmative are recommending a change.

Under the present program, the United States has made some attempts to diversify production in the South American countries. These attempts in the main have been unsuccessful, however, because of two main reasons: first, loans have been directed at industries and projects already established; second, the loans have in many instances gone into the hands of foreign capital and not to the Latin American governments themselves.

From the *International Conciliation Magazine* (367:89-155 Feb. 1941. Economic Relations between the Americas. M. Ezekiel with bibliog., maps and tabs.), for Feb. 1941, we take this statement: "Of a total forty-two and one half million dollars loaned to the South American countries in the past year, all but twelve million dollars has been used in boosting industries and establishments already in operation. Ten million have been used to construct a steel mill, two and one half in the final construction of the Pan American highway." We are not helping to diversify production. We are merely aiding the present system in a slight degree. Some of the existing projects, as the rubber reserve and the metal research are aiding mainly existing enterprises.

In the second place, the distribution of loans under the *status quo* is not directed in a responsible manner. According to Jesse H. Jones, president of the Export-Import Bank, there has been twenty million dollars loaned to the South American countries without direct accounting of the expenditure that has been made. This is an existing condition under the present policy.

Moreover, the loans that have been made have in the majority of cases gone into the hands of foreign capital. A recent loan made to the Columbia Tropical Oil Company went from that company to the Imperial Oil Company of Canada and from there to the Standard International Company. Our loans are not building up South America; they are enriching foreign capital.

Carleton Beals makes this statement: "We have no assurance or guarantee now that the American government loans are not being dissipated by dictators, used for armaments, or going into the hands of private capital controlled by foreign investors." I believe from these conditions it is apparent there is need for a change from a policy of undirected action to one of dependability as we of the Affirmative are proposing.

Having shown you why we believe there is need for a change from the present system, let us now consider how we of the Affirmative will remedy this situation and at the same time bring additional advantages.

The union which we are proposing is to be patterned after the present one, with a few main exceptions. An equal number of representatives shall be elected from each nation, excepting the United States, which shall have three representatives. This provision is to insure the northern part of the hemisphere of equal power with the southern half. We realize that any representative body without a chairman is inefficient. To provide competency and leadership in our union, we intend to provide for an executive committee of three members, who are to be elected from the group at large. In addition to any other committees which may be

formulated, we shall provide in the constitution for an economic board which is to stimulate and to direct the trade and economical policies of the hemisphere as a whole. The members of this board are not to be selected upon political or racial qualifications, but upon their knowledge of economic problems.

One of the main differences in our policy and the *status quo* is the power to act. One of the main inefficiencies of the present system is the lack of any power to act. Studying the bulletin published at Havana and known as the Act of Havana, we find there is absolutely no direct acting power given to any committees which may exist now. I challenge the ladies of the opposition to show any direct action which may be taken by any existing Pan American committee, which is not subject to control of the individual countries or voluntary ratification by those nations.

Because of this situation, we realize that we must delegate power to act.

The second main difference between our plan and the *status quo* is that we shall have an economic board, which will make a thorough and comprehensive study of the economic affairs of the hemisphere. In the light of this knowledge the board shall then set up a co-operative marketing center. Our program is not a cartel, nor an isolation policy. Our trade shall continue to flow just as it does at present, except that all imports and exports shall pass through the co-operative marketing center under a hemisphere price.

We believe that such a plan would result in several distinct advantages to the hemisphere as a whole. It

would eliminate cut-throat competition, unfair trade practices, and barter by demanding a hemisphere price on all goods, both imports and exports. We shall then be able to meet the controlled economies on common ground, a situation which is impossible under the present policy, where the individual South American countries must deal individually with the large groups which are consolidated.

Our plan would also lead to increased co-operation and united action among the American republics. The co-operative marketing center would eliminate to a great extent the rivalry among the sister republics. Argentina would not have to regard the United States as a potential enemy in the exportation of her grains and meat products. The nations would be co-operating. In this way they would be more closely bound for united action against those who aggress economically.

We also propose that our union shall be given power to diversify products in the Latin American countries. I have already shown how the *status quo* is failing to meet this demand adequately. Therefore, we shall instigate a program of diversification, develop new industries and products, and thus benefit the Latin American nations themselves instead of foreign capital.

The next power that we designate to the union is that of directing the distribution of loans to our southern neighbors. We believe that if the United States is to aid these countries with loans, that the loans should be directed at a given objective, and not used in a haphazard manner.

In order to enforce our policy, we shall organize it upon a basis similar to the co-operation system of business in the United States. All co-operation which exists under the present system will continue. We are simply extending the present system to its logical conclusion. At the same time we are giving additional benefits of unity and security.

We of the Affirmative have submitted evidence to show that there is a need for a change from our present policy because the world is evolving into four or five controlled economies. The Western Hemisphere with its present trade methods is unable to cope with this problem because we have the individual action of twenty-one republics pitted against the immense bargaining power of the controlled economies. The result is dictation of prices and terms to the Latin American nations by the dictator nations and nations with controlled economies. We firmly believe that the only solution to this problem is to adopt the plan as proposed by the Affirmative. It is a plan which gives co-operation and united action so that we can meet the aggressors on equal terms. Not until some form of united action is taken by the whole hemisphere can we hope to make the trade policies of this hemisphere safe from foreign dictation. Our action will remain insignificant so long as we are small parts pitted against a mighty whole.

We have shown you also how the present system is failing in effective diversification of production, and also in proper management and distribution of loans, and how these evils are alleviated under our plan. We

submit to you a plan which uses direct action to meet present needs and future problems. For these reasons, we ask you to agree with us that there is a need for a change from the present system and that the plan which we of the Affirmative are proposing is the answer to that need.

Second Negative, Jane Forester
Virginia Intermont

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We now have the Affirmative case before us in its entirety. The first speaker contended that world conditions threaten our economic security and that our system fails us in face of these world conditions. The second speaker furthered the line of argument with a concentrated attack on the Export-Import Bank and an assertion that a union would give our Pan American set-up the power to act: a union and an economic board which will consist of a co-operative marketing center.

My colleague disproved the need for a change in foreign policy by setting forth the very definite action which has been taken to meet current problems. Now, let us consider the second Affirmative speech.

The Export-Import Bank is singled out as the one big evil of the *status quo*. We realize that it, like any other possible instrument, will have weaknesses, perhaps in administration or structure. But those are the same two weaknesses that would be inherent in the union or any other plan. The Export-Import Bank is even less subject to such weaknesses than the untried

union because it has operated since 1934 and has been modified as trial dictated that it should. First, the indictment says that the money goes into existing industries rather than into diversification. The finding by Senator Wheeler in a Senate speech of September 9, 1940, showed that our exports to Latin America increased from $200,000,000 in 1932 to $633,000,000 in 1939. He states, in that speech, reproduced in *Congressional Digest* for December, 1940, "In aiding the expansion of Latin American trade, the Export-Import Bank will be expanding its already familiar function of opening new opportunities for American commerce." The Export-Import Bank is serving us and serving us well. The Affirmative fear mismanagement and the lack of a plan. They refer to Mr. Jones' statement that the system was void of a plan. I presume that they refer to his statement before the Senate Committee in September, 1940 when he said, "We ask for a half billion dollars to be available to do things that might appear to the administration—the President, and the Secretary of State, and other officials of the Government, to be desirable." That statement is true, but examine just what requirements and limitations are attached. No loans are made except upon the written request of the Federal Loan Administrator. No such loan is made without approval by the President. The directors represent the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the RFC. Thus, as stated in the President's message to Congress on July 22, 1940, "all interested branches of our Government participate in any loans." This gives broad and

flexible authority to those who are in the best position to administer the loans most wisely. The argument that there is no plan must fall before these findings and the fact that the plan is producing results.

As to whether the funds find their way into the hands of foreign capital, we can only say to this general statement that the most capable and experienced administrators do administer the funds. If this allegation be true, which is certainly an exception and not the rule, the defect is one for modification and not a reason for entering a permanent union. In short, the system is working. What criticisms can be brought would apply to any other plan as well. These criticisms do not warrant that the nations of the Western Hemisphere enter into a permanent union. Since the Affirmative chose to describe the loans as being made in a haphazard manner, I should like to point out that, though there were some defaults under the old Export-Import Bank, two-thirds of the loans have been repaid and in not one instance have we suffered a default.

Out of the Affirmative's attack on one isolated phase of our present economic policy in the Export-Import Bank, comes the proposed plan for a permanent union. They propose equal representation except for the United States with three members. Obviously this is to be a one house body, the United States having three members and the rest having equal representation. We do not know how many members each nation will have, but even if it is only one, there will be twenty representatives from Latin America and three from the United States. These twenty and three would direct

loans to Latin America to be provided by the United States. The picture then is a body of representatives, with the debtor nations outnumbering the creditor, speaking English, Spanish, and Portuguese, deciding how Uncle Sam's money, and how much of it, will be divided among the debtor nations.

In the Affirmative's challenge they asked us for an example of a committee under Pan-Americanism which was not subject to control of the individual nation, or voluntary ratification of the nations. If their plan for the union is one which is not subject to control by the individuals, or voluntary ratification by those nations, then even more vehemently we say, "Certainly, we do not want a permanent union of the nations of the Western Hemisphere."

They speak of the power to act. Wherein lies that power to act which does not or could not be had under the present system? Wherein is a permanent union necessary in order to give the boards and commissions which we have today the necessary power to act? Wherein lies the need to sign away our right to act as an individual nation in voluntary co-operation with Latin America? Wherein lies the need for forfeiting our policy of expediency which has met and will continue to meet the changing economic needs of the Western Hemisphere? Wherein lies the need for a union?

The opposition cites some specific things they hope to accomplish through their plan.

1. The power to act. We have just met this argument.

2. An economic board will meet and study economic

affairs. The very thing we are doing under the Economic Advisory and Planning Board.

3. To increase co-operation among the nations. The very objective of the administration's good will policy toward Latin America. The very purpose of the Co-ordinator of Commercial and Cultural Relations Between the American Republics.

4. Diversification of industries. This we pointed out in our first speech is a task which meets natural and physical limitations, but in so far as diversification is possible, as much is being done as can be done. The Inter-American Development Commission is doing the job and doing it well. It is developing new products of a non-competitive nature and stimulating trade.

5. To direct and distribute loans. We met this by showing that the Export-Import Bank, under joint management of the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the RFC, is making loans requested by the Federal Loan Administrator and with the approval of the President.

The Affirmative then, has failed to show us why or in what way the economies of the world are threats to hemispherical security. They have failed to show how the present plan of voluntary co-operation fails us in the present instance. They have failed to show us a definite, workable plan by which their union will serve our need. Until they do these things, until they show us how their union, a psuedo-political set-up, dominated by Latin America and financed by the United States, can do anything that cannot be done under our present plan; until they show what will make Latin America

and the United States co-operate better under their plan when an individual nation sees profits in not co-operating,—we are not willing to sign away our freedom of choice. We are not ready to forfeit our policy of expediency, of acting for our best interests in the way we see fit. We are not ready to lose the gains we have so definitely made toward complete voluntary co-operation under our good neighbor policy. We say, certainly, we do not want the nations of the Western Hemisphere to enter into a permanent union.

First Negative Rebuttal, Jane Forester Virginia Intermont

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Having heard the constructive arguments by both sides, let us now see just how the two cases stand.

The Affirmative has spent much time in a mere enumeration of nations which have either tried to become self-sufficient or resorted to barter as a means for carrying on trade. These were set up as a grave threat to the Western Hemisphere. In my constructive speech I pointed out that this threat was never definitely demonstrated. Never did the opposition tell us just how the economic blocks represented dangers to our security. Until this is done our argument must stand that our system is meeting our needs today and that trade between the Americas is developing and increasing under the present plan of co-operation. Our exports, as pointed out, to Latin America have increased from $200,000,000 in 1932 to $633,000,000 in 1939. Since

that time, the tightening of the war blockade has made our position in foreign trade with Latin America even more favorable. In the first Affirmative discussion much stress was placed on certain phases of the German system.

One was that the government controls entry and exit of all goods coming into or leaving Germany. This is a condition peculiar to a totalitarian system. Yet the opposition simply propose a union as if it would meet those conditions. As pointed out by my colleague, only complete regimentation would meet this condition in kind. Yet I am sure the Affirmative did not propose complete regimentation or totalitarian tactics or policies in their plan for union. As regards the barter plan, it is a recognized fact that the Germans make payment for goods bought with a pseudo-money which is worthless except in payment for German goods. As a result of this money being good for only one purpose and in only one market, Latin American business men have repeatedly declared that they want real money. We are giving them real money—not ship loads of fountain pens and toy dolls—for what we buy from them. We realize that they want and need real money. We have most of the world's supply of gold. We are buying from South America. We are paying for what we buy. We are loaning them money so they can trade. We are co-operating. A co-operative policy with America taking the lead, as we are today, will insure continued favorable relations with Latin America. This we are doing under the present plan. This we are doing without the permanent union.

The surplus problem is due in part to the war blockade. At the close of this war, win who may, Europe will need our products to rebuild the war-torn old world. To withhold these products would be foolish. To withhold them would be impossible. To prevent a recurrence of the surplus problem we are, through the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Commission, setting the stage for further industrialization in South America. Thus we will become less and less dependent upon Europe. But no matter what amount of planning is had, no matter how much we diversify, we can never rid ourselves of partial dependence upon European markets. A union certainly would not solve the problem.

Quite a point was made by the Affirmative of the imperialistic policy of England. No doubt England is to be numbered among the leading imperialistic nations, but we have never considered her as a threat to our security. Rather, we have looked upon her, regardless of the type of policy she had, as a legitimate competitor in the world markets. In many cases she has been considered as a colleague, as in the case of English capital which helped develop the United States in the nineteenth century, according to Juan T. Trippe, in *The Business Future—Southward.* Most observers do not fear England, which is given by the Affirmative as an example of a nation with a foreign policy contrary to our interests—rather do they regard England as the most desirable winner of the war from our standpoint.

Our commercial intercourse with Latin America has

become a vital part of our economy. Banking transactions incident to moving goods from the United States to Latin America amounted to over $800,000,000 last year. Our investments in Latin America are over $3,000,000,000. We are a going concern. We are co-operating with Latin America. We are getting results. Certainly we do not need a permanent union to obtain the same goals. Pan-Americanism is a reality. Step by step we are reaching an even more perfect solidarity based on voluntary co-operation. What more could the Affirmative do under their plan of union? How could present conditions be met more expeditiously? Why bind ourselves for all time with a permanent union of the nations of the Western Hemisphere?

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Camille Larsen
Weber College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There seems to be various misunderstandings, which I believe it would be advisable to clear up in this first Affirmative rebuttal. The problem of controlled economies and our stand on them seems to be uppermost in our friends' minds. In my constructive speech considerable time was spent in showing how controlled economies are being formed outside of the Western Hemisphere. This is admitted by the Negative. The difference, then, arises on the stand to be taken by the Western Hemisphere. We of the Affirmative sincerely believe we are not prepared at the present time to cope with these blocs, so we are

proposing an economic front for the Western Hemisphere, not a controlled, dictatorial economy. It is not necessary to go that far in protecting ourselves. We are simply suggesting that it would be advisable if the nations of the Western Hemisphere would meet and act as a unit in our economic dealings with foreign countries. In our plan, as given by the second Affirmative, we have pointed out how this is feasible. Our co-operative marketing center would act as a central agency through which all trade would be handled. Surely you can see this is not using dictatorial methods; it is simply a democratic way of saving our democracy—a unified action of twenty-one co-operating nations.

In refuting, our friends of the Negative have said the present system has the power to act. But this is not the case. The present system has machinery and the power to suggest, but it has absolutely no power to act. The Act of Havana, the document from which the present committees were formed, gave them no power at all. They can merely suggest. Because of this we say, there is a need for a change, and that change is the power to act.

Now, what will be done after this power has been conferred? First of all, we have said there will be diversification of production. Loans will be directed. The only attempt being made at present in this direction has not been satisfactory. Jesse H. Jones, the head of the Export-Import Bank, has said there was no direction on our part over the loans; no controlling assurance is made of where they are going or for what

purpose they will finally be used. Under our proposed system, on the other hand, capable men will be in charge and in permanent attendance, knowing it is their responsibility to see that loans are made in the correct way and used for the correct purpose—diversification. By bringing about diversification of products there will logically follow an easing of the surplus difficulty. We have not and do not intend to alleviate the surplus problem under the present system, but under our plan it will be alleviated.

Our friends of the Negative seem to feel that our organization will be overrun by the illiterate classes of South America. As this is not the case now, neither will it be the case then. As we have repeatedly said, we are merely giving the present organization some ground to work upon and the power to act.

Now, let us summarize the various points so far in this debate. The existence of controlled economies outside the Western Hemisphere is admitted by both sides. Is the present system prepared to cope with them? The Negative have said—yes, and they point to the fact that we are making loans, and that we have Nelson Rockefeller's committee which is now working on the problem. We have asked our opponents to give us one example to illustrate how the present system is coping with the problem, but so far they have not done so. True, they have given suggestions, but no concrete action that has been taken by all governments of the Western Hemisphere, because this committee has no power to act.

On the other hand, we have pointed out how we will

prepare the Western Hemisphere to meet the foreign powers by forming a co-operative marketing center—an economic front of the Americas. By so doing, we will set up capable machinery which will direct loans, which will bring about diversification of products, and, consequently, ease the surplus problem. Upon these facts, then, we of the Affirmative feel we are justified in saying there is a need for a change, and our proposed plan is the logical plan to adopt.

Second Negative Rebuttal, Marjory Rosen Virginia Intermont

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As the discussion reaches its final phase, we find that both Affirmative and Negative agree upon the desire that the countries of the Western Hemisphere work together for the best interests of all. The point of disagreement hinges upon whether our present policy or whether a proposed union would better serve our needs.

Before we are ready to turn to the new plan, we must be shown that the present system has failed. This has not been proved thus far in this debate. Rather an attempt has been made to destroy faith in the *status quo* by an attack on the Export-Import Bank and on the fact that we lack the power to act. The Export-Import Bank argument has been answered in both of our Negative speeches. Now let us again see just how the Affirmative seeks to overcome the problem that exists. They propose to send all exports and imports through a marketing center, through which

they will control prices. We have tried price-fixing and control of production here in the United States. The A.A.A. is an example of such attempt. With payment for fields unplowed, with surpluses burned and given away, warehouses still burst from capacity filling, and prices are uncertain. On a larger scale, embracing the entire hemisphere picture, confusion and failure is the only answer. Who would pay the cost of such a plan? How does the opposition propose to repeal a natural law of supply and demand? With the one house body in control, who would decide whether wheat from Argentina or wheat from Kansas would be sold, if there was more wheat than could be sold at that time? These are very practical questions which, unanswered, prohibit our acceptance of such a scheme.

The system allegedly will bring about more co-operation. Argentina concurred with much of the Pan-American policy decided upon at Havana, but stressed the fact that she had to have ratification by the government and frowned upon the entrance into a written, binding agreement. We have co-operation today. It has reached heights unheard of before. Step by step we, by our long range policy, are making for even greater co-operation. How can the Affirmative contend that by the establishment of a legislative body, by setting up the structure for a permanent union, greater co-operation can be had?

In short, everything the Affirmative is asking for is being had today under the *status quo*—co-operation, through the good neighbor policy, diversification, through the Inter-American Development Commission

and the Export-Import Bank, directed and distributed loans. Wherein lies the need for a permanent union?

Throughout this debate we have repeatedly pointed out that the Affirmative has failed to show us the specific dangers that face us. They have failed to prove that the *status quo* has failed or is likely to fail. In setting forth the plan for union they have not shown us how the existence of the union would give any more power or permanence than we have today under Pan-Americanism. They have failed completely to show what could make the union permanent if a nation or several nations decided that individual interests demanded that they withdraw.

They have failed to give us any tangible steps the union could take that have not or could not be taken under the present plan. Until the Affirmative meets these obligations, until it can justify the signing away of our freedom of choice in future dealings with the hemisphere, until it can justify our loss of sovereignty in the union, we cannot turn from our tried and practical policy of expediency to the untried, complicated, but indefinite plan for a permanent union of the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal, Betty Lou Balch
Weber College

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Negative have raised a few objections to our plan which I should like to clear up at this point. They have asked us how our union is to be financed and repre-

sented. I believe that I pointed out rather conclusively in my principal speech the number of representatives and how they should be elected. Regarding the financial backing of our policy, once again let me say it is a continuation of the present system. Each nation shall contribute upon the basis of its ability to pay. It will then be a program with each nation bearing its burden.

The ladies of the opposition would lead you to believe that the present system lacks only political power; in other words, they maintain the present system has the power to act economically. Perhaps I should ask the ladies why the Inter-American Bank doesn't assume acting powers? First, because it has only been ratified by nine nations; and second, because its actions are subject to ratification by the individual nations. What is the acting power of the present Pan-American Conferences regarding co-operative agreements? The Conference or committee has no direct authority. These agreements are subject to ratification by the nations involved, and these same countries may withdraw from the agreement if they so desire.

Quoting the Act of Havana—"The Inter-American Financial and Economic and Advisory Committee will consider various problems of a financial and economic character and *will make recommendations* to the respective governments." Regarding subversive activities it states: "to *recommend* to the governments therein that they take the necessary steps to eradicate from America the spread of doctrines which place in jeopardy the common inter-American democratic

ideal." Thus we see that from the official document of the Havana Conference—contrary to Negative assertions, the present system has merely the power of recommendation, not action.

The second speaker of the Negative quoted from Senator Wheeler to demonstrate that diversification was occurring under the *status quo* through the Export-Import Bank. In this very broad and sweeping statement she failed to show any specific action, or results of diversification, through this agency. We of the Affirmative have shown facts and figures demonstrating how the Export-Import Bank is administering aid to matured industries. Therefore we feel that our point still stands.

The second Negative speaker pointed out that all interested branches participated in loans and that such loans were signed by the President. From this statement, she attempted to show a direction and planning of loans. We do not doubt that such action does occur, but let us examine the results. In spite of directors and good intentions, millions of dollars have been spent and there is no accounting of how or where that money was spent. Does this show careful management?

We are not basing our need for a change solely upon the Export-Import Bank. This is only one example of how the present system is failing to meet a crisis successfully. So far as any actual results in good management or diversification are concerned, our opponents have given none. Apparently this agency is pouring gold into a bottomless well.

Our opponents seem to fear our one house union

controlling the use of the United States capital because Latin America will have a larger representation. Apparently they have overlooked the executive board, or counter check, set up in our union. The ladies of the opposition have side-stepped our challenge to show any direct action under the existing system and denounce our policy because it is not dependent upon individual national ratification. Here is the point. Our opponents maintain that the present system does have the power to act, but they are unable to answer our challenge to show an example of any existing action. Why? Because the present system can only suggest; it does not act. On the other hand our union has full power to act in those affairs under its administration. All other sovereign rights naturally remain with the individual nations.

Therefore, we see: (1) that the present system does not have power to act; (2) our economic board differs from the Economic Advisory and Planning Committee because it meets, suggests and acts; (3) it gives co-operation through concrete measures of a marketing center, hemisphere prices, directed loans, and proper diversification; and (4) it gives diversification to new industries not now existing.

Our opponents have stated that a plan similar to the co-operative marketing center that we propose could be set up under the present system; in fact, they stated such a policy was to be found in the cartel plan proposed by President Roosevelt. Let us briefly consider this program. The cartel plan proposed that, to aid the South American countries and to keep dictator

nations from gaining strategic positions in Latin American trade, the United States should buy up all the surpluses of the Western Hemisphere and then resell them. Regarding this plan my colleague and I agree with Carleton Beals when he makes this statement: "The cartel plan is an expensive and inefficient attempt to solve a problem single-handedly by the United States." Our policy will be less expensive and more practical, we believe, because we maintain our normal trade under it; because the United States does not buy all the surpluses, rather they are marketed in an orderly manner through the joint action of all the republics; and because our plan will distribute the cost, the responsibility, and the benefits derived equally among all.

Next, our friends of the opposition have asked us what additional benefits or advantages our plan could give over the present system. We answer in this manner:

First, we have shown you, conclusively, that the present system does not have the power of action; therefore, our first advantage is that of action.

Second, in her principal speech, my colleague pointed out that at the present time the individual Latin American countries are attempting to deal individually against the united action of controlled economies; and, as a result, are left at the mercy of their dictatorial methods. Our plan not only remedies this problem, it gives additional unity and co-operation. Thus, our second advantage.

Third, we have shown that according to the state-

ment of Jesse H. Jones, President of the Export-Import Bank, that the loans given to South America now are not being directed or used in an objective manner. Under our plan this evil will be corrected to a great degree by careful direction of loans, thus developing new industries, not old ones: also, under our plan these loans shall be directed to South American countries and not to foreign companies. Our plan gives a solution to present problems and to future needs.

We have shown you the conditions of world economy and how the present system of individual action is failing to meet the problem effectively. We have further demonstrated how our policy will meet the problem of controlled economies and provide a solution which will keep our hemisphere safe from economic and eventual military aggression. For these reasons, we believe that we are justified in stating that there is a need for a change, and that change should be in the formation of a permanent Pan-American union as proposed by the Affirmative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

UNION FOR DEFENSE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Aikman, D.—*All American Front.* Doubleday, New York. 1940. $3.00.

Army and Navy Munitions Board. *The Strategic and Critical Materials.* 33 p. March, 1940. Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C.

Beals, Carleton.—*Coming Struggle for Latin America.* Lippincott. 1938. $3.00.

——— *Pan America.* 545 p. Houghton. 1940. $3.75.

Beard, Charles A.—*Foreign Policy of America.* Knopf. 1940. $1.50.

Britt, George.—*The Fifth Column Is Here.* 124 p. W. Funk, Inc., New York. $1.00.

Buell, Raymond Leslie.—*Isolated America.* Knopf. 1940. $3.00.

Bureau of Business Research, Univ. of Michigan.—*Economic Relations with Latin America.* 75 p. Univ. of Michigan Press. 1940. $2.00.

Chase, Stuart and Tyler, M.—*New Western Front.* (Rev. ed.) Harcourt. 1939. $1.50.

Duggan, Stephen.—*The Two Americas.* Scribner's, New York. 1934.

Goetz, D. and Fry, V.—*Good Neighbors.* Foreign Policy Assn. 1939.

Hughes, Charles Evans.—*Our Relations to the Nations of the Western Hemisphere.* Princeton Univ. Press. 1928.

Inman, Samuel Guy.—*Latin America: Its Place in World Life.* 462 p. Willit. 1937.

——— *Democracy and the Totalitarian State in Latin America.* Acad. of Pol. and Soc. Science. 1938. Pa. 25c.

Institute of International Finance. *European War and Trade of the U.S. with Latin America.* The Institute. 1940. Pa. 50c.

Lavine, Harold.—*Fifth Column in America.* Doubleday, Doran, New York. 1940.

Lockey, J. B.—*Essays in Pan Americanism.* 174 p. Univ. of California. 1940. $2.00.

McCarty, H. H.—*Geographic Basis of American Economic Life.* Harper's. 1940. $3.75.

McColloch, John I. B.—*Challenge to the Americas.*

MacCormac, John.—*Canada: America's Problem.* Viking Press. 1940. $2.75.

Macdonald, N. P.—*Hitler Over Latin America.* Jerrold's. 1940. 12s. 6d.

National Economic and Social Planning Association. *War and Our Latin American Trade Policy.* The Association, 1721 Eye St., Washington, D.C. 1939.

Pan American Union.—*Latin American Foreign Trade: A General Survey 1938 to 1940.* (Foreign Trade Series.) The Union. Washington, D.C. Pa. 5c.

Phelps, E. M.—*University Debater's Annual.* (P. 263. Debate: Should the Nations of the Western Hemisphere Form a Defensive Alliance?) H. W. Wilson Co., New York. 1939.

Rippy, J. F.—*Latin America in World Politics.* 3rd. ed. F. S. Crofts. 1938. $5.00.

Roosevelt, Nicholas.—*Wanted: Good Neighbors.* (Need for closer ties with Latin America.) 48 p. National Foreign Trade Council, New York City. 1940.

Roush, G. A.—*Strategic Mineral Supplies.* 485 p. McGraw-Hill, New York. 1940. $5.00.

Scudder, E. S.—*Monroe Doctrine and World Peace.* Nelson. 1939. 75c.

Stuart, G. H.—*Latin America and the U.S.* 3rd. ed. rev. Appleton-Century. 1938. $4.00.

U.S. Tariff Commission. *The Foreign Trade of Latin America.* 3 parts. The Commission, or Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C. 1940.

——— Graphic Analysis of the Trade of Latin America. 49 p. The Tariff Commission. 1940.

Wallace, Henry A.—*The American Choice.* Reynal and Hitchcock, New York. 1940

Whitaker, J. T.—*Americas to the South.* Macmillan. 1939. $2.50.

White, William Allen—*Defense for America.* Macmillan, New York. 1940. $1.00.

Williams, M. W.—*People and Politics of Latin America.* Ginn and Co. 1938. $4.60.

Ybarra, T. R.—*America Faces South.* Dodd. 1939. $3.00.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

Academy of Political Science.—18:279, May, 1939.—*Our Foreign Policy in Latin America.* Adolph A. Berle, Jr.

American Federationist.—46:585, June, 1939.—*Export-Import Bank of Washington.* W. S. Culbertson.

American Magazine.—130:16, November, 1940.—*Hitler's Plan for* So. America. William LaVarre.

American Mercury.—45:150, October, 1938.—*What Price Good Neighbor?* L. Dennis. 51:81, September, 1940. *Hitler and American Business.* E. Lyons, 51:120, September, 1940. *Where Preparedness Should Begin: A Reply to E. Lyons.* F. B. Fox.

Annals of the American Academy.—210:127-32; 133-38; 139-44. July, 1940. *New Orientation of the Western Hemisphere,* Stephen Duggan; *Peace Audit of the Americas,* J. Schain;

Peace Among Equals, C. Davila. 211: 155-63; 164-72; 173-79; 180-85; 186-96. *Latin American Foreign Trade Characteristics.* J. S. Carson; *Competing for Latin American Markets,* L. B. Clark; *Our Latin American Trade Faces Financial Difficulties,* W. T. Moran; *Cultural Relations in Latin America.* S. G. Inman; *Economic Defense of the Americas.* W. S. Culbertson.

Atlantic.—164:75, July, 1939. *Our Southern Arteries.* F. Knox. 166:1-7, July, 1940. *Hemisphere Defense.* L. Johnson. 166:138, August, 1940. *An Army Without Arms.* T. H. Thomas. 166: 404, October, 1940. *Our Hitting Power.* Francis V. Drake.

Bulletin, Pan American Union.—73:129, March, 1939. *American Solidarity.* (Excerpts from addresses at the 8th International Conference of the American States.) 73:228, April, 1939. *Latin American Foreign Trade 1936, 1937 and Part of 1938.* Julian G. Zier, Chief of Statistical Division Pan American Union. 73-525, September, 1939. *U.S. Trade with Latin America in Fiscal Year of 1938-39.* Julian G. Zier. 74:400, May, 1940. U.S. *Trade with Latin America in 1939.* Julian G. Zier. 74:528, July, 1940. *Latin American Foreign Trade in 1937, 1938 and Part of 1939.* Julian G. Zier. 73:500, September, 1939. *Commercial Relations Between Latin America and the United States.* John M. Leddy. 74:503, July, 1940. *Convention on the Inter-American Bank.*

Business Week.—P. 40. January 7, 1939. *Making the Good Neighbor Policy Pay: Program for Developing Latin American Production of Materials Which We Need.* P. 15, April 6, 1940. *Business Discovers Latin America.* P. 37, June 22, 1940. *Economic Consequences of a German Peace.* P. 60, June 22, 1940. *Challenge in Latin America.* P. 20, July 6, 1940. *We Can Go Ersatz, Too.* P. 15-17, July 20, 1940. Holes in Hemisphere Defense: *Plan For American Economic Union Faces Wide Differences Among Governments at Havana Conference.* (Map.) P. 56, July 20, 1940. *Problem Behind Havana Meeting.* P. 47, July 27, 1940. *Nazis Score in Latin America.* P. 44, August 3, 1940. *Havana Plan Up to Washington.* P. 48, August 24, 1940. *Monroe Doctrine Gets New Teeth.* P. 16, August 24, 1940. *Welding the Americas.* P. 44, August 31, 1940. *U.S. and Canada Map Joint Defense.*

Canadian Forum.—20:100, July, 1940. *Hemisphere Defense.*

Catholic World.—148:468, January, 1939. *Brazil: A Battleground of Nazism and Facism.* J. F. Thorning.

China Weekly.—93:328, July 27, 1940. *Havana Meet Prepares Against Totalitarian Victory.* 93:362, August 3, 1940. *Havana Meet Adopts Territorial Policy.*

Christian Century.—57:105, August 28, 1940. *Our Canadian Alliance and Leasing Bases in the Caribbean.* O. G. Villard.

Collier's Weekly.—106:54, July 13, 1940. *Let's Trade for Defense.* 106:58, July 27, 1940. *If Germany Wins.* 106:86, September, 1940. *Keeping Our Southern Customers.*

Commerce.—P. 21, November, 1936. *Why Latin America Beckons.* F. L. Marshall.

Commonweal.—32:198, June 28, 1940. *How Much More Can We Buy from Latin America?* 32:366, August 23, 1940. *The Key to the Americas.* J. A. Gainard, with Hartley Howe. 32:438, September 20, 1940. *Headway in Hemisphere Defense.*

Cosmopolitan.—109:31, November, 1940. *The Pan American Way.* Stuart Chase.

Contemporary Review.—156:541, November, 1939. *Economic Future of Germany.* M. J. Bonn.

Current History.—47:29, December, 1937. *Are the Americas Safe?* G. Orbaiza. 50:28, July, 1939. *Argentina vs. United States.* Carleton Beals. 51:10, August, 1940. *Havana Conference.* 51:2-23, August, 1940. *Britain's Fleet Our Shield.* 52:15, September, 1940. *U.S. Foreign Trade in 1939 by Continents in Millions of Dollars.*

Foreign Affairs.—15:443, April, 1937. *New Era in Pan American Relations.* Sumner Welles. 19:12, October, 1940. *Hemisphere Solidarity.* Alvin H. Hansen.

Foreign Policy Reports.—15:114, August 1, 1939. *Raw Material Resources of Latin America.* H. J. Trueblood. 15:218, December 1, 1939. *War and the U.S.- Latin American Trade.* H. J. Trueblood. 16: No. 10 entire number, August 1, 1940. *Economic Defense of the Americas.* H. J. Trueblood. 16: No. 13 entire number, September 15, 1940. *The Havana Conference of 1940.* H. J. Trueblood.

Harper's.—181:225-38, August, 1940. *Wanted: A Plan for Defense.* H. W. Baldwin. 161:588, November, 1940. *Plain Speaking About Latin America.* Lewis Hanke.

International Conciliation.—367:89-155, February, 1941. *Economic Relations Between the Americas.* M. Ezekiel.

Institute of World Affairs, Proceedings.—16:27, 1938. *Geographic Bases of Pan Americanism.* M. Von Brevern.

Liberty.—17:45, October 19, 1940. *America's New Front Line of Defense.* John W. Vandercook.

Life.—8:16, June 24, 1940. *This Is How the U.S. May Be Invaded.* 9:70-73, July 8, 1940. *Defense of America: Choice of Hemisphere or Sea Command.*

Living Age.—357:467, January, 1940. *Pan America Faces World Problem.* P. Gonzalez Alberdi. 358:344, June, 1940. *Union Now for Latin America.* Anibal Jara. 358:534, August, 1940. *Latin Americans Are Not Facists.* John M. Vebber.

Nation.—150:170, February 10, 1940. *The Art of the Good Neighbor.* Archibald MacLeish. 150:726-28, June 15, 1940. *Where Trade Means Safety: Western Hemisphere Could Be an Economic Unit.* C. E. Noyes. 151:14-15, July 6, 1940. *Good Neighbor, Good Customer; Economic Union for the Americas Not Impossible.* 151:24-25. *Needed, An American League of Nations.* Freda Kirchwey. 151:207, September 14, 1940. *Nazi Challenge to Democracy.* Charles E. Noyes. 151:262, September 28, 1940. *Nazis in the New World.* Editorial.

Nation's Business.—28:25, August, 1940. *All American Trading Corporation.*

New Republic.—103:856, June 24, 1940. *Lock for the Hemisphere Gate; Proposed Inter-American Trading Corporation.* 103:17-18, July 1, 1940. *Future of Pan Americanism.* H. J. Trueblood. 103:21, July 1, 1940. *Foreign Trade After the War.* G. Soule. 103:23, July 1, 1940. *America in a Totalitarian World.* M. Lerner. 103:173-188, August 5, 1940. *South American Surplus: With Editorial Comment.* J. T. Flynn. 103:515, October 14, 1940. *Pan American Defense.* Stuart Chase.

Newsweek.—15:46, January 29, 1940. *U.S.-Latin American Trade Soaring Since Start of War.* 16:15-16, July 15, 1940. *Retort via Berlin: Views on Monroe Curtly Rejected by Germany.* 16: 29-31, August 5, 1940. *Hull Triumph: Basis for Collective Action by Americas Set Up at Havana.* 16:27, August 26, 1940. *U.S. Dickers for New Outposts to Defend the Western Hemisphere.* 16:35, September 23, 1940. *Blockade of Exports Piles*

Up; Record Crop Surplus in U.S. 16:36, October 14, 1940. *War's March Molds Americas into Closer Unit of Defense.*

New York Times.—P. 3, June 2, 1940. *If Hitler Wins. What It Means to Us.* Otto D. Tolischus. P. 3, September 1, 1940. *Hitler's Shadow over South America.* Russell B. Porter.

North American Review.—248:219. *Winter 1939-40 Should Canada Join Pan America.* Horace Donald Crawford.

Reader's Digest.—37:47, August, 1940. *Hitler Looks at South America.* Frederic Sondern, Jr.

Survey Graphic.—28:145, February, 1939. *Americas Join Up.* C. A. Thomson. 29:424-27, August, 1940. *War and the Americas.* H. J. Trueblood.

United States News.—8:28, March 8, 1940. Is the United States *Self-Sufficient?* 8:30, March 22, 1940. *Latin Trade: Boom or Bubble.* 8:9, April 26, 1940. *Trouble Spots for the U.S.* 8:14, May 17, 1940. *Troubles of a Good Neighbor.* 8:7, June 14, 1940. *Nazis Already Invading Latin America.* 8:9, June 21, 1940. *A Chink in Hemisphere Armor.* 8:7, June 28, 1940. *The Way Hitler Plans to Tackle America.* 8:26, June 28, 1940. *Latin America: A New Frontier?* 9:12, July 5, 1940. *Our Gold as Hemisphere Armor.* 9:14, July 12, 1940. *Our Basic World Policies at Stake.* 9:10, July 19, 1940. *Will Monroe Doctrine Lead Us into War?* 9:12, July 26, 1940. *Uniting the Americas in a Trade War.* 9:9, August 2, 1940. *Our Economic War Starts Against the Nazis.* 9:10, August 9, 1940. *Toward a League of Americas.* 9:7, August 16, 1940. *Four New Orbits of World Power.* 9:33, August 18, 1940. *Loans to Latin America as an Anti-Nazi Weapon.* 9:7, August 30, 1940. *How Can We Prevent an Invasion by Hitler?* 9:12, September 20, 1940. *The Economic Struggle for Hemisphere Control.* 9:9, September 27, 1940. *Toward Continental Solidarity.* 9:32, November 15, 1940. *Selling the U.S. to Latin America.*

Vital Speeches.—6:124, December 1, 1939. *Trade and Investment in Latin America.* W. R. Castle. 6:648, August 15, 1940. *Pan American Relations: The Havana Conference Results.* Cordell Hull. 6:652, August 15, 1940. *America's Economic Front.* James A. Farrell.

World Affairs.—101:158, September, 1938. *An American League of Nations.* Ricardo J. Alfaro. 103:48, March, 1940. *War Ma-*

terials and South America. C. L. Jones. 103:51, March, 1940. *The Struggle for Latin America.* J. Fred Rippy. 103:101, June, 1940. *Latin America in World Politics.* S. G. Inman.

Yale Review.—24:479, March, 1935. *A Self-Sufficient Latin America.* Carleton Beals.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE STRIKES

A Panel or Round Table Discussion-Debate

BOWLING GREEN AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* DENISON UNIVERSITY NEGATIVE

Here is something new! It was inevitable that sooner or later college students somewhere would present a Round Table Discussion-Debate similar to the famous Chicago Round Table of the Commercial Radio.

When the Editor of this volume asked the Bowling Green College Director of Debate, Prof. Upton S. Palmer, (who originally hails from the University of Redlands debate squad) to arrange for a debate on the Strike Situation in Defense Industries for publication in *Intercollegiate Debates,* he did not realize that he was going to receive something different in college debating. Prof. Palmer, enlisting the co-operation of Professor Lionel D. Crocker of Denison University and his debate squad, arranged with them the Panel, or Round Table discussion presented herewith which was originally broadcast over Station WMRN of Marion, Ohio.

The copy of the manuscript was received by the Editor the day that President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent the army to take charge of the North American Aviation Company's plant near Inglewood, California, to insure continued production of planes for defense, following the outlaw strike which began while negotiations for the settlement of the dispute were still in progress. Whether this was the "direct action" Mr. Boucher envisioned, at least the Government acted along the lines that he suggests. Needless to say this manuscript was read and is here presented with a great deal of interest and satisfaction.

Credit for this new form of college debate and for its inclusion in this volume goes to Professor Upton S. Palmer and to Professor Lionel D. Crocker. The question debated was stated: Resolved, that government should resort to direct action in the settlement of labor disputes. We pause for Station identification.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACTION TO SETTLE STRIKES

A RADIO PANEL DISCUSSION BROADCAST FROM RADIO STATION WMRN

Marion, Ohio

Announcer. From the Blue Room Studios, we present an outstanding program. It is a forum discussion by students from Denison University and Bowling Green State University, and has as its subject; *Resolved that the Government should resort to direct action in the settlement of labor disputes.*

The students participating in this forum discussion are Bob Moreland of Massillon, Ohio, and Jim Christy of Detroit, both from Denison University; and from Bowling Green State University, Larry Kuhl and Al Boucher.

We take you now to the Blue Room where the discussion is already in progress.

Boucher. Yes, yes, I agree we have a point of contention here. Of course, when we speak of direct action, we are not in harmony with what has prevailed in the past, but I insist that the economies of today have no place for rugged individualism. Adam Smith could rightly say that each individual making for his own best interest could provide for and benefit the general welfare. Now we must reverse that. We must say that to protect the *general* welfare is to provide

for the individual welfare of the citizens of any community. There is nothing new about this, we've made this transition in a gradual modification of our form of government.

Moreland. Well Al, doesn't it seem to you that in any consideration of social policy, you've got to consider the individual welfare? In other words, there's a pretty close correlation in any democratic system of government, providing . . .

Boucher. Oh, yes! Of course! But, what I mean is that the interdependence which has grown up in our own economy makes it necessary to guard the welfare of the group first.

Moreland. Perhaps, we're not quite clear on this individualism? I'm not particularly interested in what we call the economic concept of individualism, but, rather the rights of the individual as we conceive them in a democratic system of government.

Boucher. Why of course, but are the rights of the citizen in a democratic system of government to remain fixed and constant if your economic condition changes? Isn't it explainable and understandable that we should have those rights vary from time to time?

Moreland. Just what sort of a system do you advocate, Al?

Boucher. What I mean to infer is that as the economic system becomes more interdependent, as the individual must co-operate with his fellow man to provide for himself and his well-being, then you must have some form of government regulation to prevent this

excessive individualism that we have known in the past.

Kuhl. Bob! I think we have exactly the same situation that we faced when we decided on this conscription act that was recently passed. There too, we formerly had a concept of individualism, but there too, we realized that an individual must sacrifice certain things in the interests of the group; and I think a comparable situation exists between Capital and Labor today.

Boucher. Here's what I mean. Take that threatened strike in the Consumer's Power Corporation at Jackson, Michigan. There was a situation where nine hundred communities affecting over two million customers were threatened by a stoppage of electricity and gas service because a particular group of people wanted to call a strike. That is, these strikers were safeguarding their own individual, selfish interests at the expense of the community.

Christy. Al, that may be very true. I'm not particularly well acquainted with the strike you have mentioned. However, I do know that in the case of many strikes, for instance, the big strike that has been brought to our attention in the last month,—the coal strike,—and I know in the Ford strike, and in the Allis-Chalmers strike, the workers' first agreement was that they didn't want to stop work, but that they would continue work on the project at which they were occupied; but, any agreement which was made between the management and labor would be made retro-active as of a certain date. However, the employers refused to recognize this.

Boucher. Oh definitely! And, when I say the Government should use direct action in the settlement of labor disputes, I am understanding, that it takes two to make a dispute, *both* Capital and Labor. And, as far as I'm concerned, I don't care whether the Government steps in to restrain Capital or Labor. Either party . . .

Christy. You don't advocate this unless all other forms have broken down, is that your idea?

Boucher. When the Government feels that a strike is interfering with the national well-being, it is it's duty to interfere and bring about a settlement.

Christy. Well, who's going to decide just when your mediation and so on has broken down?

Boucher. The government! The government is the only expression you have of the general will. The unions are all out for themselves, their own selfish interests. The corporations, the capitalists, if you will, are interested in themselves, but, in the State, you have a body which is concerned with the well-being of the entire group.

Moreland. O. K. Al, but I think probably you are as well aware as we are of the situation that has existed every time any form of compulsion has existed. The examples, of course, are the Kansas Industrial Court, and in Australia, and New Zealand, and so forth. Every time that there is any effort to restrict either Capital or Labor, it results not in doing away with strikes, but in making them illegal. Such men, today, as William Knudsen, Paul McNutt, and Henry Stimson and so on, when they testified before the Military Affairs Com-

mittee, each one of them said that any system of coercion was definitely not the way to insure sufficient production.

Kuhl. But, Bob, when you mentioned the incident in Kansas, I think you'd have to point out that it wasn't merely the principle that was wrong there; but perhaps the application. Now, we've found that one of the chief faults with the system in Kansas was that the courts set up there, encouraged extensive litigations and long trials, so that the courts themselves became jammed with cases.

Moreland. Well you're certainly going to have some form of litigation in any government procedure you take, are you not?

Kuhl. That's true of course, but it's a matter of how much you're going to lay out. There in Kansas, I think there was an over-estimation of just how much they could handle; and the procedure itself was wrong rather than . . .

Christy. Well, Gentlemen, suppose we investigate the facts and find out just what this strike situation is? If the strike situation isn't detrimental to our national welfare, of course there's no need for government action. In the House Military Affairs Committee Investigation in which Knudsen, Hillman, Biggers, McNutt, Davids, Perkins, and Stimson testified,—all believed absolutely in *voluntary* agreement in collective bargaining. The number of strikes and the man-hours which have been lost in the past year are very, very, small . . .

Boucher. Very small. That's true! I knew you'd

say that, but that's not what I'm concerned with. The fundamental philosophy involved is whether or not you can have a community today allowing various groups in that community to disrupt the whole economy. That is, if you want to talk about self-sufficiency, then, you can have your strikes. For instance, when a small bakery shop or a tailor shop has a strike, it does not affect the community; but when, for instance, as in New York where you have 850,000 people inconvenienced by a bus strike, then it *is* the concern of the community; and I believe the community, representing the general welfare again, should step in and bring those parties to some sort of an agreement.

Kuhl. I think that another thing you have to consider is the fact that in January 1941, for example, the number of man-days that were lost was about a third over the preceding month, and about three times as much as in January 1940.

Moreland. But Larry, one thing you forget is that the crisis in strikes is already past; in fact, the papers don't have anything to say anymore. And, you notice the papers aren't saying very much about the strikes because the peak in the strike situation has passed. The National Mediation Board has . . .

Kuhl. I question that, because you'll find the same situation here, I think, as you found in England. At first, there were strikes and then, when they began to realize how important the problem was, the strikes ceased for awhile; but now of late, there has been a noticeable increase in the strikes occurring in Britain;

I think that is the same cycle we are going through in the United States.

Moreland. Larry, I disagree with you there. It so happens that in England last year, there were more strikes and more man-hours lost *per capita* than there were in the United States last year and England was at war. There were over nine hundred individual strikes in the British nation and that nation at war, couldn't even see fit to outlaw strikes.

Kuhl. Well, there I think we'd better make clear that Al and I are not advocating that we outlaw strikes, —but that we have some direct action taken.

Moreland. Well then, Larry, it comes down to this fundamental point of whether or not we want to have an authoritarian control of the Government or whether we want to have voluntary action. Now, it seems to me that it has always been the experience of employers, and of government that willing workers, free men, who have a choice and a voice in determining the conditions under which they work, give the best and most efficient production. We might paraphrase the old saying: "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink," by saying "You can drive a man to work, but it doesn't insure efficient production."

Kuhl. Well, I think we grant that, but you find the same situation existing as regards to our Army. There, too, you'd have higher morale, perhaps, if the men volunteered and were able to set up their own conditions; but yet, the country realized there that individual action had to be sacrificed in group interest.

Moreland. I don't think you can compare the situa-

tion there, Larry, because, the Army is a different organization; and everyone recognized there that you have to submit to a superior discipline because of the type of organization it is.

Boucher. What about the accepted condition that you can't strike against the Government? Isn't that a case in point?

Christy. Well, it might well be, but we're not considering whether or not you can strike against the Government at this time.

Boucher. But, it shows that coercion can exist and can be accepted.

Moreland. Al, there isn't any point in striking against the Government. No one has ever had any reason to do so. A strike isn't an overt act on the part of labor; strikes are caused, and if you want to get at the root of the thing, you should reach the causes, not merely try and stop the thing itself.

Boucher. Exactly! But, you have no reason to believe that conditions of the Government worker are satisfactory.

Moreland. Apparently they are.

Boucher. They do form organizations, but they know they can't resort to strike action. . . .

Christy. Well, what is the purpose of them?

Boucher. To put pressure on the Government, larger appropriations for instance.

Kuhl. I think we agree that we should get at the roots of the problem; but I think we are confronted at the present time with an immediate crisis.

Moreland. Well, what is this? Would you mind

telling us what this big problem is right at this moment?

Kuhl. Well, the United States has now proclaimed herself for all-out aid to Britain.

Moreland. True.

Kuhl. And to build up the hemispheric defense. Now to do this, she cannot afford to have any time lost.

Moreland. Well is time being lost that is detrimental to our system?

Boucher. Yes, definitely! You can lose time while a very small segment is going on strike,—because, again, of that worker's inter-dependence. For instance, there's an anti-aircraft corporation in California, called the Howille Casting Company, I believe. They employ only 425 workers and yet as a consequence of a strike of ten days, they inconvenienced and threatened the disruption of plane production in California involving sixty thousand workers.

Moreland. Yet our plane pro . . .

Boucher. Now why should this 425 people interfere with the rights of the sixty thousand workers?

Moreland. Yet our plane production, Al, is still ahead of schedule. In fact, all our National Defense Program is ahead of schedule.

Boucher. It isn't a case of schedule, it's a case of whether or not you can better the system.

Kuhl. Now Bob, I think there's a difference at that. This man Fritz Sternberger who wrote this book, "Fivefold Aid to Britain," points out at the present time (this book was published in February I believe),

that the United States is exporting to Britain only about three hundred planes a month which is far below what Britain needs if she is to pursue the war.

Moreland. Needs, but, not on schedule. In other words, if we can preserve our democracy and keep up to our standard of production, there is no reason in doing away with that democracy.

Kuhl. Perhaps the schedule we've set up has been hampered and has been curtailed to some certain extent because the Government realizes that things like these are going to happen.

Christy. Larry, I'd like to bring a case in court here since we're discussing the aircraft industries. We all remember the Vultee strike that occurred a few months ago. Those men were out of work for three weeks because of the strike; but, when they went back to work, they worked overtime without overtime pay and worked with a better spirit than they ever had before because the differences which were subtracting from their ability to work to the best possible degree were removed. Therefore, the Vultee schedule today, because of better spirit of the men and because of the willingness to work with the management which has agreed to decent and liberal terms, is now three months ahead of schedule.

Boucher. Well, why on earth couldn't you have these decent conditions come about as a consequence of government interference? Why must you have a strike?

Moreland. But, why, why sacrifice your democracy to insure that when it's already working.

Boucher. I insist that you don't sacrifice your democracy and that's what Roosevelt had in mind when he

said earlier in the year that whatever stands in the way of speed and efficiency in defense preparation must give way to *national* need. Do you get the point? *National* need! That is, the individual must subordinate himself to the whole general group, and that's again just a consequence of our economic system. If you want to go back to the farm and self-sufficiency, then you can have your strikes.

Moreland. Well, nobody's advocating going back to the farm, Al. What I say is this, as I pointed out before; we have to look out for the welfare of the individual because society itself is composed of individuals. We shouldn't consider society as the absolute end, and the individuals merely the means to that end. Those individuals compose society and their rights must be protected.

Boucher. That's right, but, you will grant also, that as these individual groups organize to protect or to expand upon their own selfish interest, they have no concern for perspective, for the whole field, do they?

Moreland. Apparently they do. Lots of skilled workers in this country today are working fifty and sixty hours a week without time and a half in order to expedite the defense program and as Jim pointed out here, what they've done in the Vultee Plant is just one case in example.

Boucher. One case in example! They fought for a larger share of the worldly goods.

Moreland. Yes, but that was apparently recognized as the right thing, wasn't it?

Boucher. Well, why couldn't it be recognized by the government as well?

Moreland. It might be so.

Kuhl. Bob, I think there you are assuming that if the Government steps in we are going to be sacrificing our democracy.

Moreland. Yes, you are, Larry.

Kuhl. I think you forget that the Government which is depending upon individuals is made up of individuals.

Moreland. Larry, but here's what you're saying. You're saying that labor and management as free men coming together can't settle their own differences and the Government is some super-authority and is omniscient and knows all the answers and can lay down a formula which will be adequate for all needs; and, I can't agree with that.

Boucher. No, no!

Kuhl. We don't advocate a panacea by any means. The only position we're taking is that the Government being representative of the group as a whole is more apt to work out a more equitable solution to labor problems than is either management or labor who are both selfish groups.

Moreland. Well, Knudsen contends in all his arguments before the Military Affairs Committee of the House that the situation is being absolutely handled at present, and the National Mediation Board has handled every problem that has come before it. There is absolutely no need for providing any system which he calls authoritarian.

Boucher. I don't know what you call a need. Why isn't it . . .

Moreland. If you have no problem there is no need to establish any different system is there?

Boucher. But, there is a problem. The fact that you lost six and a half million labor-hours in 1940 is evidence of the fact that you have a problem.

Moreland. But, Al, do you know this? That although we lost six and a half million man-hours in 1940, we lost twenty-eight and four-tenths million man-hours in 1937 and by the National Labor Relations Board we have cut this down seventy-five percent?

Boucher. Well, if the National Labor Relations Board is doing such fine work, why not expand its powers? Already, the Supreme Court has said that the findings of the Board as to facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. Now, why couldn't the National Labor Relations Board send a trial examiner to a scene where there's a labor dispute, investigate the facts, and give a decision?

Christy. But, Al, the NLRB does send representatives when it deems it so necessary . . .

Kuhl. But Jim . . .

Christy. And there hasn't been a breakdown of collective bargaining yet. Not one example where collective bargaining has broken down. They've always reached an agreement.

Kuhl. But Jim, the National Labor Relations Board . . .

Boucher. Before a strike?

Christy. Why no, not before a strike.

Kuhl. But that board is only set up to interpret and give decisions on the National Labor Relations Act itself, and not on all labor problems.

Moreland. Well, you're not planning to have the Government crack down on this even before the strike happens, are you?

Boucher. What I want to bring out is this. That if the Government, at its own discretion, determines that a situation is such as to inconvenience or to harm the whole people, it is its duty to step in and protect the whole people. What other representative of the whole people is there besides the Government?

Christy. Well, as Edmund Burke once said to the British House of Commons, "You can't indict a nation," and, after all, a quarter of our population are laborers. Now, it seems that we can't absolutely coerce a fourth of our population.

Boucher. It isn't coercion. That's assuming you're going to get an unfair decision.

Moreland. It is! It is if you lay down the law before they have any right to protest. In other words, the strike is the laborers' only weapon. Now, if you take away, or restrict that right to strike a . . .

Boucher. It's only a case of dealing with the active minority anyway.

Moreland. I can hardly accept that, Al. Maybe you believe that a minority manages it, but I don't. When you ask anybody who says the minority is always stirring up trouble, you usually find out that the reason they say that is because Bill Jones told them so or something to that effect. And these eight men that

Jim mentioned having testified before the Military Affairs Committee—each one of them stated that the Communists or no other minority factor had anything to do with the instigation of those strikes.

Boucher. Well, of course I am not responsible for the words of Mr. Knudsen, or for any of those men, but I do say that this is a minority. I have had experience in labor unions and if you will check up and find the attendance at labor union meetings in relation to the total membership you will find that it is an insignificant minority.

Christy. You will find that in any group, Al.

Boucher. Oh, you admit . . .

Christy. The total membership does not turn out 100%.

Boucher. Then you will agree that it is a minority that runs the thing? Then why can't it be a minority on the part of the Government that dictates the type of coercion?

Christy. It is a minority that runs anything, Al, you know that much.

Boucher. I agree.

Christy. Every single person isn't fully acquainted with all the facts relevant to his organization.

Moreland. No, but that's representative government.

Boucher. Absolutely, I agree 100%. It is a case of whom the minority is serving. Is it a narrow group, or is it the whole group?

Kuhl. Since you grant that it is a minority controlling labor unions and that they are controlling the settlement of these disputes, our only argument is that a

more representative minority would be the Government instead of the Union.

Moreland. The point is that Labor Unions are not necessarily controlled by a minority of the members, but it is a representative government, the same as in the National Government. Now all the people in this country don't favor every measure that the National Government passes. But, we assume that a majority of the people are usually behind the general policies. And that, I think, is true in Labor Unions as well. Perhaps corporate control is the best example of minority control.

Kuhl. Then, if you say that the majority of the people of the country are behind the policy of the National Government, you must also grant that if such a board should be set up, the policies of this board would be backed by the majority of the people of the United States.

Moreland. Not always. I say it *may* be. You generally consider that the Government has the backing of the people, but all of its policies do not necessarily have this backing.

Christy. Not only that, gentlemen, haven't you forgotten that it is rather difficult for someone from Washington to march into a labor-management situation 500, 1000, 1500 miles away from Washington and *immediately* take a grasp, an intimate grasp, of the entire situation and all the factors? They haven't worked in the office of the management. They haven't worked at the machine along with the laborer. They don't know what all the facts are. Therefore, aren't the manage-

ment and the labor interests here involved better equipped to solve their own problems?

Boucher. Are you going to perpetually allow yourselves to live like barbarians under the law which the jungle provides? Don't we propose and pretend to be civilized? Why can't we get around a conference table and settle these things?

Christy. Isn't that civilized procedure though? A democratic . . .

Boucher. A strike?

Christy. . . . way of doing it?

Moreland. Getting around a conference table is exactly what we are proposing, Al. But we want mediation as a means of settlement in which both labor and capital have a voice. Not where their policies are dictated to them. That's not democracy.

Boucher. If there is sufficient at stake so that neither party can agree to settlement, you are going to allow and tolerate a strike which will inconvenience the whole community?

Moreland. Parties have always agreed in the past and there seems to be no reason why they won't agree in the future.

Boucher. They haven't always agreed! You just said a coal strike of thirty days . . .

Moreland. You have a coal strike, yes. But that is merely the *overt act.* You have to have that before they ever start their mediation—many times.

Boucher. Oh, no, that's exactly what I contend you don't have to have. I want to mediate before the strike.

Moreland. All right, mediate before the strike. That's been done many times . . .

Boucher. And then . . .

Moreland. Voluntarily.

Boucher. And then, if the Goernment is unable to bring the two parties together, voluntarily, and they insist upon the strike, the Government insists that if that strike does come about and jeopardizes the national welfare, then the Government has a right to dictate terms.

Christy. But, Al, you will find this situation to exist: Since the Wagner Labor Act was passed a great many potential strikes have been settled before they ever start and the situation has been ironed out. But where tempers were so hot and where the underlying causes of the strike were so violent—such red-hot issues—a strike would occur and the mere fact that the Government says you can't strike won't prevent those strikes.

Boucher. You keep repeating that. I don't know where you got that evidence.

Moreland. Why, Al, that happened in Kansas time and again. They had the longest and bitterest strikes in Kansas after they established the Kansas Industrial Court that they ever had in that state.

Kuhl. What strike are you referring to?

Moreland. Well, the railway strike for one, I can't recall precisely what all the strikes were.

Kuhl. I think you will find that the majority of those strikes were the cause of that Board's being set up, and were in existence before that court was even established.

Moreland. According to Daugherty's book on *Labor Problems in American industry,* those strikes that I mentioned were the reasons for the breakdown of the Kansas Industrial Court Act which now has made it become a dead letter. It isn't even working now. Capital and Labor have both repudiated it.

Boucher. There's one thing I am afraid of. We are giving the wrong slant here on the idea of disputes. I mentioned in the beginning that a dispute involved both capital and labor, and capital can be guilty of wrong—just as labor can be guilty. So it isn't always a case of crucifying labor. But the Government can also step in and dictate to capital as to its terms.

Christy. But there is no necessity for dictation to anyone, Al. The situation isn't critical. According to the report that Frances Perkins sent to Franklin Roosevelt last Friday, two-tenths of 1% of the defense workers in this country are involved in strikes and one-tenth of 1% of all other workers. Now that's a very small fraction for us to sacrifice our democracy for, and have the Government tell us what we should do.

Boucher. You are not sacrificing democracy. You don't have democracy when you allow a minority to inconvenience the whole group. Take another case which is perhaps more interesting. In Cincinnati just a few weeks ago, the maintenance men of the public schools went on strike. As a consequence 50,000 students were prevented from going to school. Now is that democracy to allow a large group like that to be inconvenienced?

Moreland. Well, how was that settled, Al?

Boucher. By a few hundred people. It was settled by mediation, after the strike!

Moreland. Yes, but would the Government intervention have settled it any quicker?

Boucher. I believe so.

Moreland. Well, of course that is your opinion against mine, and it doesn't prove much of anything. But I think, Al, that maybe you would agree with me that neither you nor I, nor anybody else is going to do his best work if he has a club held over his head, even if it is an "ultimate club" as you like to call it.

Kuhl. But, Bob, I don't see where you have the idea that you are having a club over anybody's . . .

Moreland. If you don't . . .

Kuhl. . . . head any more than you have in situations that exist today when the Government sets up how many taxes we are going to pay.

Moreland. What . . .

Kuhl. Doesn't the Government set up millions of regulations that we are going to have to follow? Where is there any difference?

Moreland. But the thing is this. Where the government sets up the taxes you have to pay, it applies to the whole population. In other words, dictation of labor policies by the Government is probably going to affect one part of the population or another adversely. Now when it is settled by mediation, you have both sides going back to work on a willing basis and things going smoothly. But if the Government dictates settlement, you are liable to have one side or the other, or possibly

both, antagonistic to the whole thing and screwing up production.

Kuhl. If the Government sets up the terms, one side will have to make sacrifices. Won't you grant that?

Moreland. Probably.

Kuhl. All right. If mediation is put into effect one side will have to make sacrifices also.

Moreland. Both sides.

Christy. Both sides. Voluntarily. Voluntarily, that's the key to the whole thing, Larry. That both sides make voluntary concessions and that they go back to work, . . .

Moreland. Then they're satisfied.

Christy. . . . on a co-operative basis.

Kuhl. By the same argument, we might reason that the next time it comes time for the tax collector to come around, if we decided voluntarily that we want to give money to the Government, we will do so and if we decide we won't, then we won't.

Christy. I won't argue with you on the tax problem, there, Larry, because I don't think the situation is comparable as Bob pointed out. But I think it is important to note the testimony of the eight people that were interviewed by the House Military Affairs Committee. Take a person like McNutt, whom Norman Thomas called a "Hoosier Hitler" just two years ago when he called out the National Guards to settle labor disputes in his state, even McNutt said: "Collective bargaining and voluntary agreement." He wouldn't agree to any government cooling off period or government coercive action . . .

Boucher. I grant . . .

Christy. . . . Even a "Hoosier Hitler" wouldn't do that.

Boucher. I grant there is good political capital in praising democracy to the skies, but if we are going to compete against a totalitarian government in Germany we have got to compare ourselves with that kind of efficiency.

Moreland. You admit then, that in order to compete with the totalitarian governments we have to become totalitarian ourselves?

Boucher. No. I admit we have got to modernize democracy.

Christy. Along totalitarian lines . . .

Moreland. Well, it seems to me . . .

Boucher. Along the lines of technological advances of our *industry.*

Christy. Why fight for democracy abroad and lose it at home, Al?

Boucher. We don't lose it abroad—we don't lose it at home, I mean. We preserve it at home by preserving the orderly production that keeps the people secure, that gives them a job, that gives them bread and butter, that makes an economic system desirable.

Kuhl. Bob, what I would like to have clear now is where there is any difference between the labor and capital situation and the Government setting up taxes and any of its other regulations.

Moreland. Well, Larry, the situations are in no way analogous. The taxation system is a compulsory contribution of all people in the country to the *running*

of that government. Problems of administration are in a separate category. The production of various goods in this country is not a problem which involves everybody in the country.

Kuhl. Oh, but that is where I think you are wrong. It has been decided that it is to the best interest of this country to extend all possible aid to Britain. Will you grant that?

Moreland. Apparently, yes.

Kuhl. Well, if that's true, then once we have declared our policy, it is to the best interest of the people not to let anything interfere with our giving the fullest aid to Britain.

Christy. There are many interferences, Larry, other than the ones you like to quote here. There are a good many reasons why our aid to Britain is not what it could be. There is the governmental inefficiency, there is lack of planning in industries, there is the fact that business men put profits before a national defense interest, and a thousand other reasons . . .

Boucher. And it all boils down to . . .

Christy. . . . of which labor is but one small part.

Boucher. I grant you that, but it all boils down to the one fundamental, old, wornout premise that the individual is supreme. And it's not true today.

Moreland. Well, it seems to me, Al, that if you are going to have such a system as you advocate here, that in order to make our democracy, as you persist in calling it, cope with the totalitarian governments abroad you are going to establish a system of authoritarian control by this Government. In other words, you must

necessarily sacrifice a certain amount of your democracy, must you not?

Kuhl. We have already done that in relation to the Conscription Act.

Boucher. Isn't your Social Security Act, your Minimum Wage Law, your Health and Sanitary Laws, isn't that all interfering with the individual's right to do as he pleases?

Christy. There is no doubt about that, it interferes with the individual's right to do as he pleases, but it is for the general good.

Boucher. Yes, I . . .

Christy. Yes, Al, I see what you are going to say, but we can't agree . . .

Moreland. The thing is this. We don't agree on what's going to be the general good in the labor situation. That's apparently the thing here.

Christy. That's the point.

Boucher. Yes, you prefer the labor union to say what is the general good and I prefer the Government.

Moreland. I don't want to have one-fourth of the population antagonized. Of course, capital and labor together constitute over one half of our population, and neither of them have ever favored any system of compulsion.

Boucher. There is no reason to believe they would be antagonized. Do capital and labor profit by strikes?

Moreland. You admit that one side would have to make concessions in the system you advocate?

Boucher. Right.

Moreland. That's going to antagonize one side, while in the system of mediation both sides make the necessary and voluntary contributions and concessions.

Boucher. This voluntary aspect, I think that's subject to considerable distortion. Don't you think it's the economic situation that faces either the capitalist or the laborer that causes him to come to terms?

Moreland. And who is in a better position to decide those problems than the very men who are involved?

Christy. That's a very important point there!

Boucher. A group that is able to hold a better perspective than either of them.

Kuhl. Why, who is better to decide whether we are to go to war or not? The people who are going to go there, or their representatives in Government? It has been decided that the Government and our representatives are in the best position to decide for the interest of the group as a whole, so why shouldn't it be carried over into labor and capital disputes?

Boucher. And, I am not concerned merely with the present emergencies. I would carry this over into peace-time economy. The same thing will prevail. Under our modern inter-dependent economy we must consider the whole. The rugged individual must be relegated to the archives of treasured memories, if you will.

Christy. Yes, but you will find that the legislation which has been passed by the Government has in peace time cut down the number of strikes so tremendously that it makes it a very insignificant part of the peace time economy.

Boucher. To the extent they have cut down strikes, you will also find that they have interfered with individual liberty. The whole history of our society is the progressive limitation of individual liberty, the right to do as one pleases; and if we are going to have some form of orderly government in this country we are going to have to recognize that some form of modified democracy is necessary: that general will must take precedent over the selfish interest of the few.

Announcer. I am afraid we are going to have to cut into this interesting discussion. For the past half hour we have presented four university students discussing the topic of *direct action by the Government in the settlement of labor disputes.* The students taking part in this discussion were: Bob Moreland and Jim Christy, both of Denison University, who together won first place in the Tau Kappa Alpha Debate tournament held last month in Cincinnati; and from Bowling Green State University, Larry Kuhl, who won first prize in the Pi Kappa Delta province tournament for extemporaneous speaking, and Al Boucher, a Senior majoring in Economics. This has been a Blue Room presentation of WMRN in Marion, Ohio.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

DIRECT GOVERNMENT ACTION IN LABOR DISPUTES

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Calkins, Clinch—*Spy Overhead.* Harcourt, Brace, New York. 1937.

Commons, John R.—*History of Labor in the United States.* Macmillan, New York. 1935.

Daugherty, Carroll R.—*Labor Problems in American Industry.* Houghton, Mifflin, Boston. 1937.

Epstein, A.—*Insecurity: A Challenge to America.* H. Smith & R. Haas, New York. 1936.

Feldman, H.—*Problems in Labor Relations.* Macmillan, New York. 1937.

Johnson, J. E.—*The National Labor Relations Act.* H. W. Wilson, New York. 1940.

Keir, R. M.—*Labor Problems from Both Sides.* Ronald Press, New York. 1938.

Levinson, Edward.—*I Break Strikes!* R. M. McBride, New York. 1935. *Labor on the March.* R. M. McBride, New York. 1938.

MacDonald, L. and Stein, E.—*Worker and Government.* Affiliated Schools for Workers, New York. 1935.

Millis, Harry Alvin.—*Labor's Progress.* McGraw-Hill, New York. 1932.

Senturia, J. J.—*Strikes.* Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1935.

Ware, N. J.—*Labor in Modern Industrial Society.* Heath, Boston. 1935.

Witte, Edwin E.—*The Government in Labor Disputes.* McGraw-Hill, New York. 1932.

Senate Document.—*Hearings, LaFollette Committee.* Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C.

Gov't Document.—*The National Labor Relations Act.* Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

American Economic Review.—31:47-55, March, 1941. *Strikes in a Democracy.* D. Gagliardo. 30:803-13, December, 1940. *Measurements of the Effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Act.* J. W. Spielmans.

American Labor Legislation Review.—31:10, March, 1941. *Delaying a Man in a Hurry: Factional Labor Disputes.* 30:180-08, December, 1940. *Federal Program for Industrial Peace.* F. J. Haas.

Business Week.—P. 86, March 15, 1941. *Super-mediation? New U.S. Agency Seems Increasingly Probable.* P. 64, March 29, 1941. *Today's Strikes in Perspective.* P. 16, March 29, 1941. *Defense Against Strikes: Forerunner, 1918.* P. 16, March 1,

1941. *A.B.C. of Voluntary Conciliation.* P. 51-54, March 8, 1941. *Why Strikes Now?* P. 49-52, March 29, 1941. *Show Down Strike: Allis-Chalmers.* P. 15-16, April 5, 1941. *Balancing the Strike Accounts.* P_4 41, February 1, 1941. *Turbulent Local: Allis-Chalmers Tie-up Proves Difficult for U.S. Conciliator.* P. 46, January 25, 1941. *Murray Says, No; No-Strike Policy in Defense Work.* P. 57, November 30, 1940. *Peace at Vultee.* P. 56, November 23, 1940. *Defense Strike; Vultee Aircraft Impasse Tests Government Policy, and Outcome Will Determine Future of C.I.O. in Plane Plants.* P. 24, July 13, 1940. *Wagner Act Faces Crisis.*

Christian Century.—58:383, March 19, 1941. *Why Labor Strikes in Defense Industries.* 58:483, April 9, 1941. *Electric Chair for Strikers.*

Christian Science Monitor Magazine.—P. 1-2, March 8, 1941. *War Effort Calls for Labor Peace.* T. Nettleton.

Collier's Weekly.—107:74, March 22, 1941. *Answer to Strikes.*

Congressional Digest.—20:99-128, April, 1941. *Congress Investigates Defense Labor Problems; Fact Material and Pro and Con Discussion.*

Harper's Magazine.—181:344-53, September, 1940. *Lesson of 1917; Major Problems of Organization for Production of War Material and for Co-ordination of Forces, Military and Civilian.* F. L. Allen.

Journal of Political Economy.—49:59-89, February, 1941. *Mediation, Arbitration, and Investigation of Industrial Disputes in N.Y. State, 1937-40.* W. P. Arenwald.

Life.—10:19-25, April 7, 1941. *Public Anger at Labor Leaders Rises as Strikes Delay Defense Production.*

Monthly Labor Review.—52:675, March, 1941. *Strikes in the Latter Part of 1940.* 51:31-32, July, 1940. *British Emergency Powers (Defense) Act of 1940.*

Nation.—151:355-56, October 19, 1940. *Defense and the Wagner Act.* I. F. Stone. 151:520-21, November 30, 1940. *Behind the Vultee Strike.*

Nation's Business.—29:30, January, 1941. *Pattern for Labor Legislation.* E. S. Cowdick.

New Republic.—104:467, April 7, 1941. *Anti-labor Drive.* 104:390, March 24, 1941. *To Avoid Strikes.* 104:423, March 31, 1941. *City Editor's Panic: Strike Problem.* 104:242, February 17,

1941. *Labor and Defense.* 103:825-26, December 16, 1940. *Strikes in Defense Industries; How They Can Be Avoided.* W. H. Davis.

Newsweek.—17:68, April 7, 1941. *Defense Strikes.* R. Moley. 17: 35, February 3, 1941. *Definite Labor Policy Urged to Insure Peace in Industry.* 17:72, February 17, 1941. *Murray Super-Plan; C.I.O. Defense Plan.* R. Moley. 16:32, December 9, 1941. *Demands for Labor Curbs Grow as Strikes Slow Down Defense.*

New York Times.—P. 4, January 12, 1941. *Labor and Defense, a Proposal.* W. M. Leiserson. P. 8, June 30, 1940. *Industrial Defense Without Dictatorship.* D. R. Richberg.

Reader's Digest—37:79-81, October, 1940. *San Francisco Cure for Strikes.* F. J. Taylor.

Rotarian.—58:13-15, March, 1941. *Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes?* H. J. Allen, E. Keating.

Scholastic.—38:2, March 3, 1941. *Defense Strikes.* 38:7-8, Februaary 10, 1941. *Labor's Part in Defense; Should No-Strike Laws Be Passed or Can Labor Disputes Be Settled by Voluntary Agreements.* 37:71, January 6, 1941. *Today's Events in the Light of History: Labor and Defense.* 37:2, December 9, 1940. *Strikes in Defense Industries.*

Survey-Graphic.—30:4-8, January, 1941. *Growing Pains of Defense.* G. Springer. 30:9-13, January, 1941. *Organized Labor and Defense.* B. Amidon.

Time.—37:16, February 10, 1941. *Business Men and Strikes.*

Vital Speeches.—7:189-92, January 1, 1941. *Business and Conscription; Industry Cannot Be Conscripted Unless Totalitarianism Prevails.* P. G. Hoffman. 6:714-15, September 15, 1940. *Conscription of Industry.* W. L. Willkie.

CONTROL OF THE AMERICAN PRESS

An Oregon Style Debate

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* COLGATE UNIVERSITY NEGATIVE

The following debate between teams from Princeton University and Colgate University was held May 9th, 1941 in the Upper Lounge of the Student Union of Colgate University, Hamilton, New York. The debate was preceded by a Conference in the form of a Committee Hearing Discussion in the afternoon and was followed by a two hour open forum.

The Colgate directors of the Conference and Debate invited Mr. Wilbur Lewis, City Editor of the Rochester *Democrat-Chronicle,* to take part in the Conference.

This debate was arranged specifically by the Director of Debate at Colgate University, Prof. J. V. Garland of the Speech Department, at the request of the Editor of *Intercollegiate Debates* in order that a discussion of Control of the Press might appear in this volume. Interest in this subject began to be more intense than usual because of the attack made upon the newspapers by a member of the President's Cabinet, The Hon. Harold Ickes, shortly after the election last November. The subject was given consideration for the National High School subject for the coming season but was not chosen because more votes were registered for universal military training of all the youth of the nation under the present draft age for one year of full time service.

In introducing the debate the Chairman, Mr. Wilbur Lewis, said: "The question that shall be discussed here tonight is a timely one. Not only does it tie in directly with what already has been done in Europe but what also may be done in America. I don't mean to imply that America faces dictatorship or that a government regulated press in America will be anything like it is in Germany, Italy, Japan or Russia. Nevertheless, it is well to recognize the fact we in America are going in the direction in which the government is having a louder voice in affairs than previously. To some, it is the voice of the people; to others, it is the increased voice of predatory politicians. Whatever the men are going to say tonight I am sure we will be enlightened. As it was this afternoon in the committee discussion downstairs, this is to be a no decision debate, Oregon style.

"Here is the way it will run: The first two periods of fifteen minutes each will be given over to the constructive speeches of the Affirmative and Negative sides. The next period of cross-examination will be divided into two twelve minute periods. The second speaker for the Affirmative will cross-examine the first speaker for the Negative, and then the second speaker for the Negative will cross-examine the first speaker for the Affirmative. Each team will then be given ten minutes for rebuttal speeches."

CONTROL OF THE AMERICAN PRESS

First Affirmative, M. A. Anderson
Princeton University

MR. CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS: I trust that the Federal Press Commission we shall propose this evening will not be the voice of Russia but rather the voice of the people.*

I am going to ask you first of all for a very large share of your patience since I am going to read a five page report. Rather than make Miss Whitmore a machine slave I have given her a copy.

We wish to thank you for the excellent hospitality you have shown us. It indeed gives my colleague and myself great pleasure to be here debating Colgate this evening.

The question for debate: *Resolved, that the Ameri-*

* The reader who examines this record is asked to keep in mind these points: The debate which is here presented was preceded by a committee hearing discussion during the afternoon of the same day. Mr. Wilbur Lewis, City Editor of the *Rochester Democrat-Chronicle* who presided at the debate was also kind enough to act as a member of the committee and to appear as a witness; the debaters also served as members of the committee or as witnesses. This will account for the references to the previous discussion.

On the day of the debate Walter H. Carpenter, Jr., a Colgate senior who was to appear in the debate, lost his voice and James Holden, a sophomore debater, who was working on the question for the committee hearing took his place.

In the order of speeches it will be noted that the chairman reversed the usual order of the Oregon plan in the questioning period.

can Press should be under the control of a Federal Press Commission, is certainly a pertinent one, as is attested by the interesting and heated discussion this afternoon in the Conference on the Press. Many legitimate attacks on the character of the press were at that time brought forth, many evils in the press exposed to view, many proposals offered for the correction of these faults.

Because of the time limitation on my remarks this evening, it will not be possible for me to review these attacks or to propose a Federal Press Commission which could cure each of the evils. Rather the Affirmative has felt it necessary to restrict its discussion to an existing evil which we consider of paramount importance, an evil which demands the Nation's first consideration and which demands an immediate remedy. The evil of which I speak is that concerning press attacks on racial and religious minorities. Briefly, the Affirmative proposes the establishment of a Federal Press Commission to investigate, to warn, and finally to suppress any portion of the American Press which engages in libelous, false, or malicious attacks upon any racial or religious minority.

We define the Press in its broadest sense, including not only newspapers, but books, magazines, and pamphlets. The mechanics of the Commission we shall set forth later; it is the principle upon which it will act that we first wish to explain and defend.

We have in existence in the United States today laws of libel which protect any individual from malicious attacks by the press. All of us recognize that these

laws of libel are necessary to the protection of our citizenry. None would advocate their repeal. However, how many of us realize that "the present laws of libel do not extend any protection whatsoever to racial or religious groups. Nor is there any other law forbidding assaults on these groups." * Racial and religious minorities have no recourse to law, nor any protection against a published attack, no matter how harmful, false, or base that attack may be. And yet two of the most vital concepts of democracy are those which call for tolerance and for the protection of minority rights. How great a difference there is today between the professions of the democratic faith and actual conditions. Unless we can bridge that gap, unless we can afford protection to these groups from libelous attack, our democratic way of life is seriously threatened. With the growth of intolerance, group is set against group, suspicion and hate permeate and destroy the social fabric.

We have only to view the case of France to realize the demoralizing and disastrous effects of intolerance. For France collapsed, it is known now, because she was a nation disunited. If such can happen in France, a nation largely of a homogeneous population, what hideous potentialities exist in intolerance in the United States with her heterogeneous population? In America, so long known as "the melting pot of the world," many races and religious groups have long lived, intermingled, intermarried, fused. That process must be permitted to continue. It cannot go on if our press is allowed to

* Quoted from Judge Matthew J. Walther of Ohio.

destroy democratic, united America by a policy of intolerance, attacks on fellow Americans because their skin happens to be of a slightly different hue than ours or because their God or their system of worship does not coincide with ours. Such attacks are not only possible today, they have actually taken place, and they cannot be forbidden by law as things now stand. The following citations will illustrate.

Negroes. Southern newspapers have recently repeatedly attacked the negroes as a social and intellectual inferior of the white man and have consistently opposed the adoption of legislation designed to make effective the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to restrict lynching. The situation in the South has been so bad that one finds Mississippi has descended to an all time low in American legislative history by passing, in the 1920's, the infamous Social Equality Law, "an act to make it a misdemeanor to print or publish or circulate printed or published appeals or presentations of arguments or suggestions favoring social equality . . . between the white and negro races." And the founders of our country had the unmitigated audacity to state in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created free and equal!"

Noel P. Gist in his *The Negro in the Daily Press** states that 46.9 per cent of all negro news in the seventeen papers which he examined (at random) was "anti-social." George Eaton Simpson in *The Negro in the*

* 1932. Not listed in Cumulative Book Index for 192- to date.

Philadelphia Press† published in 1936 states: "the racial attitudes of white newspaper readers may be affected by the selection and presentation of such negro news and non-news as the metropolitan papers do carry . . . distortion . . . are reinforced by . . . the magazines, novels, and newspapers." Reaction to negro crime news is given by Simpson as follows: "Made me more hostile and bitter toward negroes," "They should turn machine guns on them and wipe them out!" "All Negroes should be strung up and burned." Those were actual results of a canvas carried on by Mr. Simpson and these were the reactions of normal, average American people. Intolerance is being spread today by the press and nothing in existing law can check that intolerance. Let us go on to the second category.

Jews. Violent attacks upon Jews have been published in Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent* and in many rural newspapers. *The International Jew,* a reprint of the articles, because of popular demand, which appeared in the *Independent* has this to say in its preface: "The International Jew and his satellites, as conscious enemies of all that Anglo-Saxons mean by civilization, are not spared, nor is that unthinking mass which defends anything a Jew does. . . . Neither do these articles proceed upon a false emotion of brotherhood and apology." The titles of some of the articles printed are: *Jewish Plan to Split Society by "Ideas." Does Jewish Power Control the World Press? Anti-Semitism—will it Appear in the United States?* All these questions are answered in the affirmative. Father

† P. 90. 1936 Univ. of Pa. Press. $2.00.

Coughlin in *Social Justice* Dec. 5, 1938 flayed the Jews, accusing outstanding American Jewish bankers of financing communism in Russia, especially Kuhn, Loeb and Co. To bulwark these accusations, he has no proof. Samuel Roth in *Jews Must Live** has this to say under the heading: *Why the Gentile does not want the Jews in his pet playgrounds;* "the Jew temperamentally knows no dividing line between business and pleasure; the Jew's general appearance, like that of the negro, the mongolian and the gypsy, is hostile to the peaceful state of mind of the gentile trying to relax and play; a Jew's . . . manners are those of a barbarian; the Jew is unclean and he makes unclean any place which he learns to call home." And there is no protection against such statements in existing law. Let us go to the third category.

Catholics. In 1938 many newspapers and magazines declared Alfred E. Smith unfit, as a Roman Catholic, and as a representative of an alien, non-Nordic element in our culture, to serve as President of the Protestant, Nordic United States. For example, in an editorial on October 18, 1928 *The Christian Century* declared: "(Protestants) cannot look with unconcern upon the seating of a representative of an alien culture, of a medieval Latin mentality, of an undemocratic hierarchy and of a foreign potentate in the great office of President of the United States." The article referring to Smith as a representative, in implication, attacked all Catholics simply because of their religious beliefs.

During the campaign of 1928 many bigoted pamph-

* 1934. 319 p. Golden Hind Press. 77 W. 47th St., New York.

lets appeared, pamphlets bearing such titles as: *"Convent horror, Illustrating what will happen to American Womanhood if Smith is elected; Traffic in Nuns; Three keys to hell; Rum, Romanism, and Ruin; Thirty reasons why a Protestant should not vote for Alcohol Smith.**

With so much to feed upon, should racial and religious intolerance get out of hand in this country, it could not be stopped. Bigotry cannot be put on a leash; from attacks on Jews, Negroes, and Catholics the disease will spread with rapidity to other groups and denominations.

The Affirmative believe that the establishment of a Federal Press Commission rigidly defined in respect to composition, powers, and procedure would alleviate the evil of press attacks on these and on all minority groups, without in any sense imperilling the freedom of the American Press. The Commission would be composed of the two major parties represented in direct proportion to their representation in Congress. Upon the publication of any false or malicious attack upon racial or religious groups by a section of the American press, any American citizen might bring this attack to the attention of the Commission. The Commission would then investigate, and if, by a two-thirds vote, it decided that the assault was false or malicious, it would issue to the newspaper or magazine concerned a warning to refrain from future publication of such material. If one, newspaper, magazine, or publishing house, were

* J. A. Ryan *Catholic View of the Election.* Current History. December, 1928. P. 379.

five times convicted of violating the law, the Commission would force that publication or firm to cease publishing. The case might then be appealed to the Courts, where the Commission would have to defend its action.

Obviously, the establishment of such a Commission would lessen the danger arising from published preaching of racial and religious bigotry, not now prevented under the law. It may reasonably be supposed that no newspaper, magazine, or publishing house would risk being enjoined from publication by continually assaulting races and religious sects, while the adverse publicity stemming from individual violations would make members of the press more hesitant than they now are about publishing even isolated bigoted articles. The Commission would, therefore, serve its purpose well.

It would in no way endanger freedom of the press in thus making for greater tolerance, for the Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors, and the Supreme Court of Minnesota, as well as the *Nation,* the *Christian Science Monitor,* and W. S. Paley of the Columbia Broadcasting System have stated that freedom of the press and radio cannot mean licentiousness or libel. Furthermore, the Commission we propose would be strictly limited by law, and its action could in no way be extended arbitrarily.

The greatest evil existent today, that of the practical legal immunity of the press in its attacks on racial and religious minorities cannot be allowed to continue, and can be quickly and safely alleviated by the Affirmative's proposal of a Federal Press Commission. Freedom of the press will not be endangered, and, above all,

tolerance, the basis of our democratic society, will be preserved and protected.

First Negative, James A Holden
Colgate University

MR. CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS: Mr. Anderson has just convicted and accused the United States of being intolerant toward its minorities. He didn't define exactly what that prejudice of the American people was but he implied by the examples he gave that there very definitely was a feeling—I don't know whether that was throughout the United States, Mr. Anderson, or in certain sections of the country. For instance, that attack on the Negroes—if that was confined to the South that could be written off as being a result of the Civil War, something the South must simply outgrow. But, if it is universal, how are you going to get the representatives of your Commission to agree to suppress any vituperative words against these racial minorities?

Now, there are some other questions that arise in connection with the things you said. You gave no specific examples on just how the press' attack on these minorities and discriminations against them are preventing the assimilation of our minorities. I believe that was the point underlying the discussion. You thought our attack on these minorities was dangerous, because it kept the minorities in this country unassimilated.

But in another respect, the attacks upon these

minorities are parallel to the attacks on other kinds of minorities,—and by other kinds of minorities I refer to labor—I refer to the Government as a minority in this respect. There is no particular reason why you should single out attack on racial minorities as opposed to attacks on any other kind of social forces in this country. Therefore, I think my speech that has been written out beforehand will apply to the racial minorities as it has to the other things I mention in this speech.

We are not going to try to present to you a freak or clever case for this debate. We are going to say just what you probably expect us to say. Just because freedom of the press is a much abused phrase, a label for propaganda, a flag to wave for the cause of publishers, and a drum to beat when a change in the *status quo* is suggested,—we should not be blinded to the true meaning and social significance of the phrase as it applies to the press in the United States. It is this deeper and truer meaning of press freedom that we want to explore and understand.

We are defining freedom of the press as the right of publishers to adopt and pursue a policy for their readers without government interference. No proposal has been made that free speech, religious worship or right of assembly be under the control of a federal commission, and we think that editorial opinion falls within this same classification of basic rights.

What has been the result of this freedom as it exists today? Would anyone here be willing to accept the burden of proving that the American press is not the

best in the world? There is little doubt that the American press has the most adequate coverage, foreign and domestic, the largest, highly-trained staff of newspapermen, and the fullest presentation of what its reporters see, on earth.

How do the newspapers build public opinion? How determining an influence does the press have on the minds of its readers? The answer seems, without going into a lot of technical opinion, to be a golden mean. The newspapers help build public opinion, but do not dominate it. For instance, a large majority of the press favored Willkie, while the electoral returns last fall showed a considerable majority in favor of Roosevelt. This is not unique in our history, as it happened in the elections of 1936 and in 1800 with the election of Thomas Jefferson.

To be sure the press is prejudiced in its editorials as well as in its news columns. Prejudiced as everyone of us are, as the lobbies in Washington are, as the New Dealers are, and as the business men are. What of it? That's the way democracy works. Has the editorial policy had a singularly poisoning effect on our minds? Not noticeably,—if the electoral returns just quoted gave us a labor administration against the express wishes of the press are to be taken as straws in the prevailing wind. Hence, is there any special reason why the press should be under control of a government commission any more than lobbies? And the nature of human beings being what it is, could the control be any more effective than the attempt to control lobbies?

There are cries that the press is not liberal enough,

but we notice that the New Deal is giving the liberals a lot of the kind of legislation that they want despite the press. It certainly, therefore, can't be said that the liberals have no effective opinion and influence on the Government. Although there isn't a preponderant majority of newspapers representing the liberal view, several can be named. For example, *PM*, and *The Philadelphia Record.*

Let us examine the idea that labor, a minority, is not getting a fair break from the press. In the first place, labor has a prejudiced viewpoint itself, and if the papers will not print that viewpoint intact, experienced newsmen tell us that labor unions consider this sufficient reason to call the papers unfair. Further, we believe that the reason the papers often print stories about strikes, riots, etc. is that this type of news is different and sensational, and much more newsworthy than an ordinary, peaceful picket line. And I think the same principle applies to sensational stories about the Negroes, the Jews, and the Catholics.

But the point is that in spite of many papers having prejudiced viewpoints on various matters, there are some papers representing all viewpoints. We have the liberal papers I just mentioned also. We have a labor press of 8,000,000 circulation in this country. The outstanding example here is the United Automobile Workers' publication which issues 400,000 copies every two weeks, and on off weeks publishes 90,000 copies of Ford Facts for unorganized workers, especially Ford employees. We have the religious press. Further, any organization can start other papers. And

besides this, we have the radio, today giving out much news and information. The radio has been a most important method of contact with the public. Witness Roosevelt's Fireside Chats, Willkie's speeches, Coughlin's sermons and tirades. It might be mentioned, although there is no proof, that the novelty of the radio for political purposes has had a more striking effect on the public than the routine news columns and headlines. So it is apparent that when an important political issue is at stake the various interests concerned see to it that the public knows through their regular or special publications or hear of it over the radio. If we are to regulate what the press says, we must also regulate the message over the radio.

Now, it seems in view of what the Affirmative has said about prejudice against racial minorities that they can organize as other minorities have and can meet the political issues which arise in their cases as other minorities have risen to the occasion when their interests were at stake.

Therefore, it seems to me, that a Federal Press Commission is not going to accomplish what it heads toward unless it is given so much power that our press is going to become in effect the same kind of a press we have in the totalitarian states. If the Affirmative believe their commission as it is now set up is simply going after the one evil of prejudice against racial and religious minorities, we might easily extend our libel laws in which case there seems no sense in going into a long Press Commission with all its attending dangers of possible standardization, suppression of news which

means the power to destroy, and, as a result, have other social functions follow the same road as the Press into government control or ownership, and be swallowed up into the same kind of folly that Europe has had so much trouble with.

Affirmative Cross Examination of James A. Holden by John Gunn, Princeton University

Mr. Gunn. Mr. Holden, I'd like to ask you one question first. I think that question must have come to the minds of most of us in the audience as we listened to your speech. That question is simply this —did you listen to Mr. Anderson's speech, Mr. Holden?

A. I did.

Q. Perhaps you can explain a few things which seem incomprehensible. Why did you ask him whether those intolerant press attacks on the Negroes were restricted to southern Negroes, when he specifically stated, giving full information, that the attacks were throughout the country, and one book dealt entirely with attacks on the Negroes published in the Philadelphia Press. Another book was of attacks selected at random throughout the country. That, in perhaps a little length, is my question.

A. Since the attacks on racial minorities is universal, that is, it is a nation wide proposition, what makes you think those ingrown prejudices aren't going to be the same in the case of the Commissioners on this Federal Board?

Q. That brings up another question still related to

the main question of whether you listened to Mr. Anderson's speech. Once again you seem to be laboring under grave misapprehensions. You seem to think there is a universal prejudice against Negroes. What he was pointing out was that there is published—not in all, not in a majority, not in a great number of papers,—but there is published attacks on the Negroes. How would that demonstrate the fact there is a universal prejudice against the negroes?

A. I thought he was making that a nation-wide principle.

Q. No. He said they were published throughout the country.

Another question, still related to whether you listened to his speech or not, why give us this long speech about labor and the rights of labor to fair treatment in the press, etc.?

A. Because Mr. Anderson pointed out the press was flaying the Jews, for instance, and I was pointing out the press was flaying labor and other minorities in which case I don't see why you pick out a single racial prejudice.

Q. I see. Now we are getting somewhere. In other words, because there exist a number of evils in the press, any attempt to eliminate one evil is ill-founded?

A. I didn't call that an evil.

Q. Oh, I see. Mr. Holden does not call attacks on the Negroes, Jews and Catholics in the press an evil?

A. Freedom of the press is the right of a publisher to speak his editorial opinion, and isn't an attack on racial minorities and labor, editorial opinion?

Q. A right to publish editorial opinion in the news columns; is that what you are defending?

A. Yes.

Q. We shall undoubtedly get to that later. Why talk about extending the laws of libel to eliminate this when you don't call it an evil? When he pointed out in his speech with quotes from a Judge in Ohio that these laws of libel cannot be extended, and when you know perfectly well the libel laws apply only to individuals and are intended only to give individuals redress, and when you know perfectly well in order to win a libel suit you must establish substantial damage which would be almost impossible for the members of a maligned race to do,—why, Mr. Holden?

A. Well, because I think it falls under that general classification. To use your words this afternoon "vituperative words"—the libel laws might be modified to include those and have that effect.

Q. In that case we agree completely. Frankly, we are trying to extend the principle behind the laws of libel. That must have been obvious if you listened to the speech but you can't do it by extending the laws of libel. Take the principle and extend that and then you have accomplished your purpose.

Another question—you say our particular Commission can't accomplish its purposes without extending its powers. You give for that assertion no reasonable proof whatsoever. You make a blanket assertion. Why? I'd like to know frankly, why it can't?

A. Would you state the question again?

Q. Why can't it? The question is why can't our

particular Commission accomplish its purposes without extending its powers? That is my question.

A. Because if a Federal Press Commission is to control to the extent of suppressing the news, it must have ultimate power of some sort which you invest in your Commission members,—bi-partisan members. Is that right?

Q. Frankly, first of all before answering that question, I'd like to get back to the original question. You say you listened to Mr. Anderson's speech. I can't understand how you could possibly say this Commission is going to suppress news. It isn't.

A. If it is suppressing editorial opinion is that not suppressing the right to free press, or do you disagree?

Q. I do not in any way. You heard the case outlined—five violations; action taken only after violations; no action before; the same principles also may be applied and cited as fundamental ones. There is freedom of the press with no action before but any individual publisher is responsible for what is printed in his columns and if it is illegal . . .

A. The result is suppression; whether it is after the news or not is cold potatoes.

Q. Well, frankly, I don't see how that is suppression. Maybe you can explain it to me. I seem to be rather stupid.

A. If a man is liable for what he prints after it has been published and the Commission takes action and says he can no longer do this and express his editorial opinion, why isn't that suppression in the long run?

It is just delayed until after he has put out the first attack.

Q. The same argument, of course—another instance of suppression is the law of libel. You want to extend these laws of libel and make a newspaper responsible for any attack—false or malicious—on a man. That is suppression according to your definition. Or don't you support the laws of libel?

A. I don't support any extension of the laws of libel.

Q. Now you are not supporting any extension of the laws of libel?

A. No. I am pointing out that is what you are doing—extending the laws of libel.

Q. I thought you were offering that as an alternative? Now you are pointing out that is what we are doing. In that case we agree with you. One more question. Just how would this Commission result in the loss of freedom of the press?

A. I thought we just went through that.

Q. I am not satisfied with your argument. You must have something besides that in saying this Commission will interfere with the freedom of the press, because if that is so we don't have freedom of the press, therefore we don't have to worry about it being suppressed. We don't have freedom of speech or free assembly or individual action because we are always responsible for any mis-steps we make in pursuit of our right to liberty.

You have a right to swing your arm around but if another gentleman happens to be in the arc and your

fist happens to hit him, then you are responsible for assault and battery. So you don't have any freedom to swing your arm around, do you?

A. Certainly you have freedom to swing your arm around but the point is if you are going to suppress—well, wait a minute, I am not sure what question I am answering. Will you repeat it, please?

Q. The main question as I recall it—how would this Commission suppress freedom of the press? You say because if the press should violate the laws it would be punished for those violations. All right. Then, I simply went on to point out according to that principle there is no freedom of the press; no freedom of speech or free assembly or individual action because, always, under all circumstances the individual or social force is responsible for the misuse of its liberty and that, you say, is equivalent to having no liberty.

A. Well, the point in that connection I tried to get across was that if you are going to extend this principle of controlling the newspapers against minority attacks, you are automatically going to have to extend it to attacks against other minorities.

Q. Why?

A. Because the other minority interests fall in the same category.

Q. Why?

(*Time*)

Negative Cross Examination of M. A. Anderson by Robert Brandt, Colgate University

Mr. Brandt. I presume you listened to my colleague's speech so I won't have to question you as to whether or not you did and why you didn't give certain answers.

I am afraid I didn't appreciate the novel approach you had this evening. I think there must be something behind it, and in this cross examination I propose to find out what that something is that the Affirmative is hiding from us this evening.

First of all, do you believe the freedom the press has at the present time to attack such minorities is about the only evil that exists in the press today?

A. We think that is the paramount evil.

Q. There might be other evils?

A. There might be.

Q. It might be unfair in its attacks on labor?

A. It might be.

Q. Many people believe it is.

A. To quote Mr. Holden "the idea labor is not getting a break is false."

Q. I, too, listened to Mr. Holden. Is it not true many people believe labor is not getting a fair break?

A. Many people believe many things.

Q. I will take that as an answer. I might not have listened to your speech. Does your idea apply to editorial or just news columns?

A. Editorial as well as news including magazines, pamphlets, etc.

Q. Anything printed?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you. Must there be a whole article or just one or two veiled hints?

A. Something that would fall under the present statutory principle of libel.

Q. Libel of race or religion in effect, is that it?

A. No. On the statue at present libel is defined only to individuals. Take the same definition and apply it to these others.

Q. In other words, the extension of the libel laws from the individual to races?

A. In effect, yes.

Q. Now, you gave a number of examples—a number of quotations—to prove various things. But later in cross examination it came out that while newspapers throughout the country do this, it is not the consistent policy of the majority of American papers to go after certain races or religious groups.

A. We have not contended that it is the policy.

Q. Then that is true—it is not the policy. Thank you very much. Are there very many of the larger papers in the country engaged in this practice—I mean big city papers—New York, Chicago, San Francisco, etc.—are those papers doing this?

A. Mr. Simpson went through the *Philadelphia Ledger* and other Philadelphia papers and he draws his conclusions on the attacks of Negroes there. Mr. Gist took papers at random.

Q. You'd say the larger papers as well as the smaller? Is this the consistent policy so far as you

know? Do these papers—all these papers throughout the country—print occasional articles or is it consistent policy? Can you expect to find some sort of an attack whether veiled or open upon minorities groups you spoke of?

A. That would be difficult to say without a complete canvassing of the press. It would be an assumption on my part.

Q. You wouldn't say it was the consistent policy to do this?

A. No.

Q. Now I wish to ask you, is it not true in this country we can find all sorts of shades of liberalism, conservatism, racial prejudice, etc. in either major parties as well as minor parties? You can find a person very anti-Negro or anti-Jew or anti-Catholic in the Democratic party as well as the Republican party. Is that true?

A. That is true.

Q. Likewise there are men who are "pro" all these things in the different parties?

A. That is true.

Q. In other words when you set up a bi-partisan board to handle this matter, "bi-partisan" doesn't mean much because you are not handling strictly political matters. You are handling, for instance, religious matters on which people don't split on party lines. Is that true?

A. Re-state the question, please.

Q. I fear it was a bit complicated. Is it not true

you are setting up a board along political lines on which . . .

A. We have to set them up along parliamentary lines.

Q. Is it not true you are setting it up along political lines although on these matters people are not split according to party lines?

A. That is probably true.

Q. I wish you would give a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Is there sufficient of this Negro-baiting, Jew-baiting and anti-Catholic matter to justify the setting up of a special federal commission, with probably the necessary Constitutional amendment before that could be done, to handle the matter. Do you think there is enough to justify such a step?

A. In the first place a Constitutional amendment would not be required and you have presented no proof it would be. I think the potentiality of any possibility of attack would justify it—not the bare possibility. And, I have given facts.

Q. Would you not agree it is abridging the freedom of the press to make a study of racial or religious groups and draw certain conclusions whether favorable or not to certain groups?

A. If it were not libelous . . .

Q. I am probably not up on the libel laws as much as you are. Tell us very briefly what sort of an attack on the Jews would be libelous.

A. I couldn't give you that briefly.

Q. Would you tell us briefly what attack on the Negro, Jews or Catholics might be libelous? Give us

an example of a couple of names so I have something to sink my teeth in.

A. I might call—let me see now—I might call a Catholic "a representative of a foreign potentate" or "a man of mediaeval, Latin mentality."

Q. I see. Well, would you agree to having a person write a book in defense of the Jews in this country?

A. Defense has nothing to do with libel.

Q. It would be perfectly all right for anybody to write the defense if he desired?

A. Of course.

Q. In other words, we could have a great mass of literature saying good things about the Catholics and Jews but couldn't have any attacks on them whatever?

A. Democracy is built on tolerance not intolerance.

Q. I see. I mean, yes. Can you imagine any paper being caught your requisite number of five times that would submit immediately to being suppressed? Don't you rather think most papers, magazines, or book publishers would probably take the matter to the courts?

A. I don't believe so. Not with public opinion aroused against them.

Q. You believe not?

A. I believe not.

Q. Do you believe that papers exercise such control over public opinion they dictate to people matters of national policy?

A. "National policy" is an awfully broad term.

Q. The policies of the Federal Government.

A. Dictate the policies? No.

Q. Largely instrumental in bringing about federal policies?

A. In certain cases. You'd have to give certain examples. It is too broad.

Q. Would you say it had been really successful in thwarting Roosevelt's desire to change anything?

A. Perhaps in the Supreme Court fight.

Q. In any considerable number of cases do you think they have been successful? . All this time the press has been going after the New Deal.

A. But you can't apply this to racial or religious minorities. Your analogy might be bad.

Q. I see. Well now, you say the paper is going to have to do this five times before they could be suppressed. What will happen if somebody publishes a book. This is silly. He hasn't libeled anyone five times.

A. That is the publishing house.

Q. In other words they could circulate four books before the publishing house can be nailed?

A. The very fact the Commission has warned the publishing house, and has told the people why, should make them wary.

Q. Is it not possible in the time of a great crisis these persons should decide to stir a campaign against the Negroes and all publishing houses could publish four books.

A. Anything is possible but not probable.

Q. Would you say that success in this matter might lead the Government to consider restricting attacks printed on other minorities in this country?

A. The Government might.
Q. It is quite possible?
A. I don't think it is quite possible.
Q. But the possibility does exist?
A. Possibilities always exist in any consideration.
(*Time*)

Negative Rebuttal, Robert Brandt
Colgate University

MR. CHAIRMAN, FRIENDS: It is my duty during these last ten minutes to gather together somehow, in some sort of logical form, the arguments as we think we have seen them presented this evening, and to give a final interpretation of our case in the light of what the Affirmative has said.

Frankly, we are rather upset by the interpretation the Affirmative gives to the question. The question was stated: *Resolved, that the American Press should be under the control of a Federal Press Commission.* We took this to mean that the Press would be regulated by a commission similar to the one in charge of Radio. The Affirmative has limited the control to a very small issue compared to those possible. We feel the Affirmative to a large extent has been begging the question. We feel they have picked out something about which the other team will not be prepared, which is really a very small matter in any discussion of the press today, as I believe has been proved by any number of articles and problems read, and perhaps by the discussion this afternoon. Perhaps we from Colgate did not properly

study the question and missed a great mass of material which has come out on the subject and brought up by the Affirmative. But I do not think, if this is a paramount issue when it comes to freedom of the press today, that we of the Negative would have entirely missed this issue. Perhaps that accounts for some of the things my colleague said in the prepared, constructive speech which appear not to fit in with all the Affirmative has said.

We believe, whether the Affirmative is doing this consciously or not, they are taking only the first of a great number of steps which will finally end the freedom of the press in this country. I believe, and the Affirmative has admitted, the possibility that if the Commission finds it has been successful in curbing attacks on these three, it will come under the control of certain parties who might decide it would be desirable to curb attacks perhaps on labor or on capitalists and somehow extend this curbing of attacks on various groups. At any rate, we of the Negative feel you are abridging the freedom of the press when you say you cannot make a study and reach certain conclusions if those conclusions aren't the nicest and easiest things for the minorities to swallow. You can talk about the technicalities of the libel principles, etc. but that is what it boils down to.

If you say a Catholic is a "representative of a foreign potentate" I can't see as that would have a great and profound effect upon the readers of this country.

It has already been demonstrated even when a great majority of the press supports or opposes, as in the

case of Roosevelt and Willkie, that the majority of people in the country don't fall in line and follow along with the press when they have all the other avenues of information open to them. They are usually able to make up their minds whether the press agrees or not. It is true the press has some influence but I wish to point out that the papers, especially since the start of the crisis in Europe some years ago, have been fairly sympathetic in their attitude toward the Jews, especially since the Germans have come into power and persecuted them.

I believe it has been fair in its attitude toward the Catholics. It is true the Jews, Catholics and Negroes are going around with a sort of chip on their shoulders. They have seen what happened in the other countries and they are afraid any little thing will be the start of the same campaign against them here, and they yell "wolf" more often than necessary. That is why we get the impression these attacks are being made on them.

You will also remember many defenses have been written of racial equality; and religious freedom you must admit has existed in this country for a good many years. Up through my high school years I lived in Philadelphia and I read the papers very carefully and very diligently. I am not conscious of any bias, and I think my friends will agree on that. I cannot quite see it. I have been reading very carefully—and, incidentally, I am not a front page reader, I read all the way through—I have been reading those Philadelphia papers which showed the great bias toward Negroes.

I believe the average person doesn't read the newspaper as carefully as I do and if I failed to detect that, from the basis of my experience, any attacks were perhaps not the most harmful things in the world.

Furthermore, you of the Affirmative admitted you do not know these attacks are consistent policies of the papers that make these attacks. You have also admitted you are setting up a board to control these matters on a political basis and the opinion in this country on religious and racial grounds as a whole is not divided on political basis. So that is just a nice way of saying this is a little above the humdrum affairs. Actually it proves nothing.

It would be possible for a President actually anti-Jewish, if elected, to appoint anti-Jewish persons from both parties and these people could construct these things said as not being libelous. They could say, "that is O.K. We are not going to give you a warning for this." On the other hand, a President might appoint a number of persons who would be very touchy about this matter of attacks on minorities and they might be inclined to pick up the smallest things.

Of course these papers and magazines would want to take the matters to the court and I believe no newspaper would go out of business as long as there is a chance to take the matter to court. Even though you have passed legislation and chosen a Commission, eventually when it comes to a question of suppression, the matter will probably go to court and if most of them are going to court, what is the sense of a Commission in the first place?

We are opposed to the Commission, not so much for one little matter, but we feel it is the opening gun in an attack on the freedom of the press in this country. If the Government is successful in suppressing attacks on certain religious minorities, we feel the Government will have a precedent, and the people will become used to the restriction of the freedom of the press to publish for its readers what it wishes; restriction to pursue an editorial policy that seems desirable, not to the Government, not to the majority of the people, but to it. That is not just our opinion but it comes from Justice Sutherland when explaining what the freedom of the press is. Perhaps the present court would slightly change that, nevertheless, that is the latest idea we have to go on and we feel any attempt such as yours to suppress attacks on Negroes, Jews, and Catholics is definitely suppression of some of the freedom of the press; is taking away some of their liberties to pursue editorial policies they desire. We believe, as was said once before this afternoon, the real test of the truth is to put that truth up and let it prevail against falsehood.

I would remind you that you said it was not the consistent policy of the press to occasionally print some attack, and that the majority do not do that but rather support these minorities. Then, do you believe it is possible that any such attacks made here and there are going to be successful? And are these few attacks proper justification for the first step in a campaign which is going to take away from us our whole freedom of the press?

Affirmative Rebuttal, John O. Gunn
Princeton University

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I think a great deal of what I am going to say now was said in the cross examination. I think I pointed out then a great number of things which will bear repetition and which, since the Negative have offered us so very, very little to go on, must of necessity be repeated if I am going to cover my ten minutes.

In the first place, let me take up Mr. Holden's speech. Remember, Mr. Holden is the constructive speaker for the Negative. They have one constructive speech that is to bring out all the constructive arguments. The case rests on that constructive speech; and they can bring out no new material on cross examination. Now, let us take up Mr. Holden's speech.

In the first place it was obvious from his constructive speech and from my questions to him in cross examination that he didn't listen to Mr. Anderson's speech or else he had a very excellent speech he intended to deliver, debate or no debate. We agree with him it was a very good speech but don't see where it came into the debate and I am sure very few people here see where it came in.

He offers in defense of this racial and religious intolerance, as I pointed out in my cross examination, simply the allegation that the press is also intolerant of other minority groups so why pick out those. The answer is that Mr. Anderson and I are true believers in freedom of the press. I believe that point was made

clear this afternoon in our discussion and I believe again tonight.

We are making no proposal we think would endanger the freedom of the press. We would rather permit an evil to exist if it cannot be remedied without abridging the freedom of the press. But, here is an evil that can be remedied by establishing a Federal Press Commission and can be remedied without the dangers which accompany any other proposals.

I think you will all agree with me, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the Negative case was a mass of contradictions. In the first place they say the press has many evils; and attacks on racial and religious minorities are only one of these. Later they say attacks on racial and religious minorities are no longer an evil. I don't know where an assertion of that sort fits into the very democratic stand our opponents desire to take and attempted to convince us they were taking. They know as well as we that this nation, above all other nations, because it is composed of such heterogeneous masses,—because it has so many racial and religious minorities—cannot view with anything but alarm attacks on these minorities. They know those attacks cannot be stopped once the Jews, Catholics, and Negroes have been maligned in the press, and if that policy is not stopped by any constructive action of the government, those attacks are going to be extended.

Naturally a Baptist, who is so sure his is the only true religion, would deny freedom to the Catholics and also to the Presbyterians, Lutherans, etc. The same is true of racial attacks. You can't put a leash on

bigotry. Allow it to start in one little place and it will continue, Ladies and Gentlemen; to allow that racial intolerance and religious bigotry—would disunite us in a time when we need unity more than ever before. And furthermore, to allow those attacks to spread would negate democracy and destroy it. That was one contradiction.

Another—first they say, "let's have an alternative proposal. Extend the laws of libel," and later on in cross examination Mr. Holden says he favors no extension of the laws of libel. No, that isn't evil any more!

Furthermore, we get a good example of what our opponents are proceeding on—how sound ground they have—when Mr. Brandt tells us he has read the Philadelphia papers for some time and he is not conscious he is intolerant or bigoted, so they couldn't have any effect on the general public. Mr. Anderson in his speech on the other hand gave quotes to demonstrate what effect the attacks had. He quoted housewives and the average man. Mr. Brandt is evidentally not an average man. We are quoting the average man because that is where intolerance is going to take hold and will spread and destroy our democracy.

Finally, they say they would fail to establish a Commission because—well now it is an evil, but just a minor evil and you don't set up Commissions to establish control over minor evils. The same argument applied to subways—you won't attempt to make the subways more safe because the subway is a minor means of transportation.

I think their argument is open to attack along the

lines of inconsistency throughout and can be reduced to absurdity by carrying out the principles they themselves set up. Their case in short is this:—first, this Commission would abridge the freedom of the press. In the first place, I showed in cross examination that our opponents don't believe there is freedom of the press because to punish violations of the libel law is to abolish freedom to print what it wants to;—secondly, as Mr. Anderson pointed out, this Commission is to extend, to make safe the freedom of the press in this nation. I would like to quote to you an article written in the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1938: "If there be any menance to the freedom of the press in the United States today, it is the menace which comes from the unscrupulous within the ranks of the profession."

The gentlemen of the Negative tell us we need no action because the attacks take place in only a small part of the press. We say the press itself desires such restrictions because it knows if they aren't undertaken now, eventually the enterprise will fall under the attack and then you will lose freedom of the press.

Secondly, our Commission would not remedy the conditions it was set up to remedy. For that I point out in cross examination they offer no proof. Frankly, they don't seem to know what we advocate. "Our Commission would not remedy racial and religious attacks because it is bi-partisan and racial intolerance and religious bigotry don't divide along party lines. People in both parties are prejudiced, therefore, it won't work." Again they say that eventually all decisions will be appealed to the courts so why set up a

Commission at all? Frankly, the Negative in those assertions is denying the entire recent course of political history. The courts are over-loaded with business at the present time. Whenever a new evil is discovered, that evil is discovered, that evil is now referred to a Commission—a governmental set-up whose powers are not authoritarian; a commission whose powers cannot get out of hand because the Commission is restricted by law and also by appeal to the courts from its decisions and must defend those decisions in the courts.

That is their case, Ladies and Gentlemen!

On our hand, we point out the imperative need and set up a constructive solution and there are no assertions from the Negative to deny the need or constructive nature of our proposal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

CONTROL OF THE PRESS BY A FEDERAL COMMISSION

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Algie, R. M.—*Journalists and the Law Relating to Defamation.* Auckland Univ. Coll., Auckland, N.Z. 1935.

American Academy of Political and Social Science.—*Freedom of Inquiry and Expression.* American Academy, Pa. 1938. $2.00.

Bridgman, G. F. L.—*Pressman and the Law.* Pitman. 1938.

Doan, E. N.—*Work Manual for the Law of the Press.* Journalism Press, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. 1937. $1.

Ickes, Harold L.—*America's House of Lords.* Harcourt. P. 50. Pa. 75c. *Freedom of the Press Today.* Vanguard Press. 1941. $2.50.

Martin, K.—*Facism, Democracy and the Press.* New Statesman. London. 1938. Pa. 6d.

Patterson, G. J.—*Free Speech and a Free Press.* Little. 1939. $3.00.

Seldes, G.—*Lords of the Press.* Messner. 1938. $3.

Sullivan, H. W.—*Contempts by Publication.* Frank T. Day, Inc., 729 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 1940. $10.

Williams, C. S.—*Liberty of the Press.* Row. 1940. Pa. 48c.

Young, E. J.—*Looking Behind the Censorships.* Lippincott. 1938. $3.00

SPECIAL BOOKS

Dearborn Independent—*The International Jew.* The Independent, Dearborn, Mich.

Gilbert, F. C.—*Jewish Problem.* 1940 Review and H. $1.50 Pa. 75c.

Goldstein, S.—*Toward A Solution.* Putnam. 1940. $2.50.

Howarth, E. J.—*Why Anti-Semitism?* Bass. 1940. Pa. 50c.

Roth, Samuel.—*Jews Must Live.* 319 p. Golden Hind Press, 77 W. 47th St., New York. 1934.

Samuel, M.—*Great Hatred.* Ryerson Press. $2.50; Knopf. 1940. $2.

Strong, D.—*Organized Anti-Semitism in the United States.* American Council on Public Affairs. Pa. $2.50.

Ford, J. W.—*Negro and the Democratic Front.* International Publications.

Gist, Noel P.—*The Negro in the Daily Press.* 1932.

Reuter, E. B.—*American Race Problem.* Crowell. 1938. $3.

Simpson, George Eaton.—*The Negro in the Philadelphia Press.* University of Pennsylvania Press. 1936. $2.00.

Van Deusen, J. G.—*Black Man in White America.* Association Pubs. 1938. $3.00.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

American Photographer.—35:42-45, January, 1941. *Freedom of Photography.* O. W. Martin.

Christian Science Monitor Mag.—P. 2, March 1, 1941. *America's Open Forum.* W. H. Chamberlain.

Nation.—151:562, December 7, 1940. *Open Letter to Mr. Ickes.* 152:130, February 1, 1941. *Naval Censor.* J. Daniels.

Scholastic.—37:15-16, September 30, 1940. *Builders of American Democracy; John Peter Zenger and Freedom of the Press.* H. A. Tarr.

Time.—36:68-69, November 18, 1940. *New Deal vs. Newsmen.*

Vital Speeches.—7:286-87, February 15, 1941. *Academic Freedom and Freedom of the Press.* H. W. Chase. 7:467-71, May 15, 1941. *Freedom for What? Preserve a Free Press and You Save America.* W. D. Fuller.

THE FEDERAL POLICY OF RESTRICTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Intramural Debate

WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE AFFIRMATIVE *vs.*
WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE NEGATIVE

The following debate on the Federal Policy of Restricting Agricultural Production is an intramural debate of the Washington State College Women's teams which won the Inland Empire Women's Tournament held at Walla Walla, Washington, Dec. 7, 1940. Besides using this subject in the league debate the Washington State Women debaters engaged in 16 debates during the season on this subject.

The discussion shows the interest, natural for a state college group, in what is happening in the Agricultural world as a result of National Policy. In meeting each other the Washington Women debaters had in mind seeking publication of their debate, and the manuscript of the speeches was gathered together by their coach and director, Prof. William H. Veatch of the Department of Speech of the State College and submitted to *Intercollegiate Debates*.

THE FEDERAL POLICY OF RESTRICTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

First Affirmative, Velma Calvin
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The question we are discussing this evening is: *Resolved, that the Federal System of restricting agricultural production should be discontinued.* First, let us see what federal system is in operation at present that does restrict agricultural production.

The first federal legislation that really restricted agricultural production was passed in May of 1933. In January of 1936 the Supreme Court decided this act unconstitutional since nothing in the Constitution gave the Federal Government the right to restrict agricultural production, and that consequently such power could rest only with the states. Immediately the idea was again introduced into Congress and the law that we have at the present time was passed in 1938. The present law gets by the decision of the Supreme Court by doing nothing directly to restrict agricultural production. It provides for no payment to the farmers for ceasing to produce, but does provide for three types of payment to farmers, given ostensibly for other reasons but given only to these farmers who do conform to governmental restrictions upon agriculture. The announced purpose of this legislation is to assure

to the farmer a profit on his commodities, but in practice it assures such profit only to those who conform to production restrictions.

Under this legislation the farmers were to receive three types of payment from the Federal Treasury. The first was to be called soil conservation payments, the second to be called parity payments, was based on index prices from 1914 to 1917, while the third payments were to be in the form of loans to enable the farmers to hold surplus crops over to years when there were no surpluses. In all three of these cases, however, the law was stated in such a way that only farmers conforming to government restrictions on production could collect payments.

This then, is the picture of the present indirect federal system of restriction of agricultural production. What is responsible for this whole situation? We find the answer by looking back to 1929. During the depression of that year, when stocks crashed, industries folded up, and unemployment became widespread, the farmers, too, were adversely affected, for the bottom dropped out of farm prices. The Federal Government wanted to help the farmer by raising the prices paid for his product. They felt that the so-called "farm surplus" was the evil, that the farm price problem could be corrected by removing surplus through curtailing production; and so they stepped in with their plan to raise farm commodity prices by cutting down farm production; and finally when threatened with the holding up of their plan by the Supreme Court de-

cision, they prevented that decision from effecting it by substituting the present indirect system.

Now that we have seen the complete background of this question let us look at the system of agricultural restriction in operation both during the years when it was functioning openly and at the present time when its functions are more under cover and concealed. I believe that the present federal system of restricting agricultural production is economically unsound and that it has failed in practice to carry out the purpose for which it was established.

I believe this plan to be economically unsound because it is an attempt to meet a sick and abnormally low demand with a sick and abnormally low supply rather than by attempting to cure the original abnormality. One of the important causes of the 1929 depression was monopoly in industry. To alleviate the results of this cause, the Government has attempted to create a monopoly in agriculture. In other words, the Government has been attempting to meet one bad condition by creating a second equally bad condition. It has failed to consider the fact that you cannot create wealth and prosperity by destroying the wealth that caused prosperity. This is the type of plan that the present system has attempted to create and this is one great reason why it is economically unsound and should be discontinued before this economic unsoundness brings greater distress to the country as a whole. Such greater distress must be the result of a negative plan which does not even attempt to cure the real cause of the difficulty. This present plan is further unsound in

that it assumes that all surplus of agricultural products is undesirable and should be eliminated at any cost and at any injury to our economic structure as a whole. This plan attempts to remove our entire agricultural surplus while a great portion of it is actually needed by people of our country.

A survey made by the United States Bureau of Home Economics shows the following: "Excluding those on relief, 25% of the city families and 15% of the farm families are found to be on diets containing little more than one half as much calcium as they need."

One of the best sources of calcium is cereals, including bread: and wheat and other cereals form one of the groups that the present system attempts to restrict to the greatest degree. The need of the American public for more of other restricted products can be equally well shown. Statistically, too, it can be shown that surpluses are not necessarily evils as the advocates of the restriction policy assume. Use for this purpose only figures from the year-book of the department of Agriculture; use, moreover, all their figures, not merely those from selected years. The figures on the value of the wheat crop start with 1866. The 35 years from 1866 to date that show so-called surplus crops gave the farmers of the country nearly four hundred million dollars more than the 35 years of so-called short crops. Yet the present policy of restriction attempts to create so-called sort crops every year. Look at the record from the same source on values of the cotton crops, which start with 1876. The thirty years from that date to this, that show so-called surplus crops of cot-

ton, brought the farmers of the country nearly eight hundred and fifty million dollars more than the thirty years of so-called short crops. Yet the present policy of restriction attempts to create so-called short crops for every year. In other words the present policy of restriction, if applied to the past, would have decreased farm income if it had accomplished what the sponsors of it intended to do, namely, eliminate surpluses by decreasing production. These are just a few examples of the economic weakness of the present system of agricultural restriction in attempting to decrease the imaginary evil, the surplus, rather than attacking the cause of the real evil.

Besides being economically unsound, while in operation the plan of restriction has injured the country as a whole where it has actually resulted in restriction. Very interesting proof of this point is made in an article on "The Crop Reduction Back-fires" by J. E. Boyle in the *Saturday Evening Post* for January 2, 1938. "Crop reduction is a serious matter to impose on the economic life of this country. Administrator Tolley as announced that restriction expects to cut the 1937 cotton crop of 18,700,000 bales to a 1938 crop of 10,500,000 bales. This is a net cut of 8,200,000 bales. The government itself recently printed some figures showing the cost in labor to produce a bale of cotton. These figures covered the years 1909-1936 and show an average cost of 250 man-hours per bale. If the Federal Restriction Policy reduces our cotton crop as planned, it will dispense with the labor required to produce 8,200,000 bales of cotton or over two billion man-hours of la-

bor. The cost of this idle labor, if put on WPA jobs at the standard wage would be $900,000,000." Let me add to Mr. Boyle's statement the fact that the only alternative to this is starvation for the farm laborers thrown out of employment by this restriction policy. But Mr. Boyle continues, "This is only part of the picture. Curtailing cotton by eight million bales reduces the freight traffic of the southern railroads by 2,000,000 tons. The Government announces a cut in wheat production sufficient to make a drop of 5,000,000 tons in the freight business of the northern roads. This means more men on relief rolls and hence more cost to the government for relief and more men on bread lines. The crop restriction program of 1934 put 3,500,000 men into the ranks of the unemployed. Thus the crop curtailment program disrupts the entire American economic life. The restriction plan's false philosophy of controlling surpluses by reducing output will, if continued, make the depression permanent in the United States."

Thus we see that as a practical measure, where it has resulted in restrictions, the present policy of the Federal Government has actually damaged the economic life of the country to a greater extent than it has helped.

In closing, I am very certain that the federal policy of restricting agricultural production should be discontinued because of the fact that it is economically unsound, since it assumes that all surpluses are bad, which is definitely not true; many of them are needed seriously in our economic life. The policy should be dis-

continued, because it attempts to remedy the evil of low demand with low supply instead of attempting to remedy the low demand, which results in the destruction of food when people are starving and in the destruction of other products which our people need. As a working policy, the restriction of agricultural production should be discontinued because, where it has resulted in real restriction, it has destroyed employment and wealth, injuring the rich and poor, farmer and city dweller, the man on the relief rolls and the man gainfully employed—alike.

First Negative, Elna Schmitz
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Miss Calvin, who has just spoken, has condemned the restriction of agricultural production as being economically unsound and a failure in practice; and if I understand her correctly, she must believe that this restriction should cease and cease at once. In taking this attitude, you will notice that Miss Calvin did not suggest anything to take the place of the policy of restriction. By taking such a stand, the opposition put themselves in a position where they must answer several pertinent questions. How does the Affirmative plan to handle the present existing problem caused by the excess of agricultural production over consumption? They may answer very glibly, as I have heard Affirmative teams say before in answer to this question, "Why, by increasing consumption, of course." But, the very logical and very

necessary question that follows is how does the Affirmative plan to increase consumption. That is a thing that every farmer, every farmer co-operative, every dealer in farm products, every grocer from the independent dealer to the largest chain, every corporation dealing in food products has been working on for decades. Unless the two young ladies of the Affirmative can produce a plan better than all of these others could create, and prove to us tonight that it will succeed where all others have failed, they will have failed to show that there is anything to take the place of the present plan which they wish to abolish. If they cannot find something to take the place of the present plan, the removal of the present restrictions which they advocate will result in increased supply, which in turn will cause lower prices to the farmer. This will be a direct threat to the welfare of the whole farm group, lowering its income and thus definitely lowering the income and prosperity of the entire nation. We shall be interested in hearing Miss Ryan tell us how they plan to increase consumption.

Furthermore, how and when do the Affirmative propose discontinuance of the plan to take place? Farmers who have been relying on soil conservation payments, parity payments, or other payments for goods not raised will find it difficult to adjust "overnight" or from one season to another, should these payments be suddenly cut off. How is the Affirmative going to carry the farmer over this period of adjustment; or are they just going to let him struggle, or are they going to discontinue the system gradually? Does the

Affirmative plan that the whole practice of soil conservation be terminated? Miss Calvin insisted that soil conservation is a part of the restriction program. Is all of the work being done to prevent erosion to be discontinued? Does the Affirmative advocate that the sub-marginal lands, put out of use through the restriction program be once again brought into production to compete on the open market and lower the income of the farm group? This condition would certainly be highly undesirable. We will also be interested in hearing Miss Ryan's explanation of the Affirmative's policy in regard to these matters. These are practical problems which must be solved by the Affirmative before they can be justified in advocating the discontinuance of restriction.

Let us now examine the other contentions of the Affirmative and see if the objections made to the present system of restriction are actually valid. Miss Calvin has pointed out that the Government is attempting to cut down production while people need food. To substantiate this argument, she contended that diets showed lack of foods on the restriction list. Does this directly prove that the program existing today is bad, or does it prove that many people may need instruction as to dietary needs? According to the *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* August 1939: " . . . the very poorest families do not lack bread, cereals, fat meats, beans, peas, and starchy things generally. These foods which the Government is attempting to cut down are had for the most part in sufficient quantities by all families." We see from such a statement, that foods

on the restricted list are available to the people, that it is not the program—but perhaps other factors—which may be responsible for unbalanced diets.

The Affirmative contended further that the restriction plan is basically unsound in that it destroys wealth. This is a broad assumption and far from being true. The goods which the Affirmative speak of as wealth are not actually wealth unless they can be moved and sold. Do they consider as wealth, produce which cannot be sold and must be put in storage, to have rent and insurance eat up any possible profit? Thus the restriction program does not actually destroy wealth, but puts wealth into the hands of farmers to take the place of goods which could never have actually been turned into wealth.

The second main contention of the Affirmative was that the program of restriction led to unemployment and to the disruption of American economic life. Let us see if the federal program has been entirely responsible for unemployment, or if the depression and other factors may have had a hand in the picture. According to the *Monthly Labor Review,* June, 1939: "The number of hired workers on the farm underwent little change from 1909 to 1929, but fell sharply thereafter." Several causes are indicated. First of all, many workers returned to farms owned by themselves or their families and others rented or purchased lands. Thus family workers replaced hired workers. Furthermore, the progressive adoption of labor-saving techniques on the farm was a prominent cause of unemployment. Now the Affirmative has attempted to place

the blame of growing unemployment almost wholly on restriction of agricultural production. Quite contrary to such reasoning, we have seen that the crop reduction program played only a small part in the picture. The main objections then, to the present system of restriction have been examined, and found to be without substantial basis.

Let us go ahead and further examine the existing system to see if the aims of the restriction of production program have been accomplished. May I point out that the plan we are discussing was put into existence as an emergency measure. The Affirmative admitted that during the depression the farmers were adversely affected; the bottom dropped out of farm prices. Something had to be done and it had to be done quickly. I should like to show that this emergency program was the only possible answer to the problems at hand, and that the original aims of the program have been accomplished.

First of all, can the Affirmative deny that surpluses have been kept down? The federal program was never meant to create a scarcity of food, rather it was a plan to absorb the excess products. And this the plan has done with reasonable success. Had production continued during the past years on a free scale, surpluses today would have risen to an alarming height. The *AAA Bulletin* indicates that 66 million acres were seeded in 1939 in contrast with 81 million acres seeded for 1937 and 80 million for 1938. Thus we see that production has been kept down by the program.

Secondly, the plan has achieved an increase in the

farmer's share of the national income. *Business Week* reports that the farmers' cash income was raised from four and one half billion dollars in 1932 to eight and one half billion in 1939. The farmer's dollar, according to January 1940 *Fortune,* was worth 15 cents more in 1939 than in 1932, that the farmer was better off today than in 1932 and much better off than in 1929. *New Republic* indicates that the farmers' business index was ninety-three percent of normal in 1939. The *AAA Pamphlet* states, "Farmers were able to buy ninety-nine percent as much of the goods as they needed as they could buy in 1932. The farm machinery sales increased 371 percent from 1932 to 1939, in the farm states auto sales increased 184 percent. Twenty percent of the people unemployed between 1932 and 1939 went back to work as the result of the increased farm purchasing power." From such facts and figures we may conclude that the program has substantially aided the farmer.

The third aim of the restriction program was soil conservation. Today we see that much is being done towards reclamation of areas which were useless. Farmers are co-operating with the program because they recognize the need of conserving the soil for future production. The last aim—that of cutting off sub-marginal lands—has also been effected through the plan. The Affirmative then, in suggesting the program be discontinued, evidently believe that it is more desirable to use sub-marginal lands and forget about soil conservation. Logically, such action would only undo

all the good which the program has accomplished thus far.

Briefly, in summary, we have seen that restriction of agriculture, put into existence because of an emergency, has accomplished its four main aims: surpluses have been kept down; the farmers' share of the national income has been increased; soil conservation has been undertaken; and sub-marginal lands have been put out of use.

In conclusion, I should once again point out that so far in this debate, the Affirmative have merely objected to the crop reduction program as being an unsuccessful attempt to deal with the problems at hand. They have admitted then, that there were problems to be solved, but they have suggested as yet no better way to help the farmer, who, it cannot be denied, has needed help.

They have yet to find a solution for the problems which will immediately arise should the present system be discontinued. Increased production demands either new foreign markets (this is quite impossible because of the world conflict) or new domestic markets. The latter alternative is a vague possibility; if the Affirmative plan on accomplishing such a feat, we must have adequate substantiation that it could be done. The Affirmative have yet to tell us why it would be desirable to stop soil conservation and to put sub-marginal lands back into use. Lastly, we ask the Affirmative to explain how and when they expect to discontinue restriction.

Because the aims of the federal plan to limit production have been accomplished as nearly as possible;

because new problems would spring up should the program be discontinued, we of the Negative believe restriction of agricultural production should be continued.

Second Affirmative, Shirley Ryan
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My colleague, Miss Calvin, has shown you that the federal system of restricting agricultural production is an economically unsound policy; that it attempts to destroy food when people are going hungry; that it destroys employment and wealth by attempting to curtail production; and that even so the government has not accomplished what it set out to do.

In her discussion of the question, Miss Schmitz of the Negative has presented the evils of the agricultural situation from 1929 to 1932. She then went on to show that these bad effects have been gradually decreasing from 1932 to 1941, leaving us with the assumption that because restriction came in 1932, that the alleviation of the agricultural ills was due to restriction and conveniently forgetting that all business in the United States was on the down grade from 1929 to 1932, and that all business in the United States was on the upgrade from 1932 to 1941. I am afraid that we cannot accept this casual assumption that Miss Schmitz draws without some proof of what the argumentation books call the casual relationship of these two. Personally, I place much greater credence in the statement that agriculture would follow all other

business on the upgrade than in the statement that an economically unsound policy like restriction, which has actually decreased employment and destroyed wealth could have caused any upswing in agriculture.

In advocating the abandonment of the present system of agricultural restriction, we of the Affirmative further believe that it has failed to accomplish the objectives for which it was established. It was the belief of those who placed the restriction policy in effect that the subsidies and restrictions would decrease as the plan became effective. In other words the ultimate idea was to place the farmer in a position where such subsidies and restrictions were no longer needed. They anticipated that as the plan began to work, and achieved partial success, that the subsidies and restrictions could be decreased until, when complete success was achieved, the subsidies and restrictions both would have been completely eliminated. Where does this leave the Negative with its argument that the restrictions and subsidies should be continued now, after they have been in operation for nine years. In asking for their continuance, the Negative must either admit that the plan has failed, or if they consider that it has been successful over the nine year period it has been in operation, but still do not think that it should be eliminated, they must be asking for its continuance as a permanent policy for no reason at all.

According to the *New Republic* for May 1940, subsidies to the farmer have been steadily increasing. If the major proponents of the policy expected to decrease them as the plan succeeded, what assumption can be

drawn from such increases except that it is failing? The *AAA Notebook,* published by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, reminds us that "For 1937-38 farmers seeded wheat on more acres than ever before." Evidently there is something wrong somewhere when after five years of a policy of restriction we find the largest seeding on record. We of the Affirmative believe that this continues to show that the policy of restriction has utterly failed and that its abolition would certainly not harm the farmer and the country as a whole, even if it did not greatly benefit all concerned.

Another aim of the federal policy was to raise the farmer's income. In this attempt we find that the prices he has had to pay have remained disproportionately high. Based on 100 as an index for 1922-28 it is shown that:

	Food prices	*Prices paid*
1929	146	153
1936	114	127
1938	95	130
1939	93	120

For these same years the taxpayer's money has been affected thus:

1936	$287,252,000
1937	$366,899,000
1938	$482,221,000
1939	$807,065,000

From these figures we can readily see that the farmers' income has actually been proportionally decreased at a heavy cost to the taxpayer as a whole, including these same farmers.

When the farmers have been restricted as to the amount of land to be put into production, they have intensified their farming so that their lands have yielded increased production. Actually, then, restriction has failed, because production has increased, not decreased. My colleague has pointed out that reduction, which was an aim of the restriction policy, would have been a decided evil. Finally, then, had the plan of restriction succeeded, it would have been disadvantageous.

Not only has the federal system of restricting agricultural production failed in its objective, it has brought with it further evils. Davis tells us "I believe that these subsidies tend to sap the farmer's morale, to keep more people on farms than the country needs there, to hold down the *per capita* income of the farmers in the longer run, to induce farmers to surrender too much of their freedom to bureaucratic domination."

Naturally the nation opposes a cut from its income for the maintenance of a failing policy of restriction of agriculture.

How shall we achieve a balanced agriculture? The *Rotarian* for May 1940 tells us that the surplus of agricultural commodities resulted from underconsumption and positively not from over-production. We of the Affirmative contend that a method of increasing consumption is far more profitable than a policy of restriction of production.

We agree with much of the AAA, aside from the restriction policy. Starting May 1939 the Federal Sur-

plus Commodities Corporation developed the Food Order Stamp Plan. It worked well, and by the end of December 1939 it had been extended to more than 30 cities. This is only one feature of the policy for increasing consumption.

The FSCC has been buying millions of dollars' worth of surplus commodities and making them available to the consumer. A simple illustration may help here. Assume that there are 600 people in a community, and material enough for 600 pairs of shoes. Only 500 people have sufficient funds to pay for a pair of shoes. We ask you—would you prefer paying the shoemakers huge subsidies to produce 100 pairs of shoes less, thus depriving many who were in need of shoes? Or would you use the money to buy the 100 pairs of shoes and distribute them? There is only one answer.

But, you may ask, why has the FSCC allowed many to remain in need of food? The answer is relatively simple. A corporation of its kind cannot be maintained without sufficient capital. It has been increasing its work steadily, however, and an increasingly great number of people have been helped. It is our contention that if the money used at present for subsidies to farmers were used for purposes of the FSCC, the work could be carried to its fullest extent.

The Food Order Stamp Plan has been helpful to thousands. This the Negative cannot deny. Why not build from a succeeding policy instead of inhibiting the farmer and the consumer through a policy of destroying wealth?

We cannot cut the surplus. We must distribute it.

We challenge our friends of the Negative to prove that there are any evils existing in our present farm problem which cannot be controlled through a program which embodies crop insurance, soil conservation, distribution of surplus, and a marketing control of surplus.

Summarizing briefly, we have pointed out that the federal policy of restricting agricultural production has not accomplished what it set out to do. It has not curtailed production; it has not helped the farmer's income; and it has not been economically sound. Further than this, the AAA has been successful in every phase of its program except the policy of restriction of production. Consequently, there has been no need for the attempted curtailment. Finally, and most important, is the fact that other evils have crept into the policy set up by our friends of the Negative. The American nation has been paying to starve its citizens.

Therefore, we of the Affirmative stand resolved that the federal policy of restricting agricultural production should be discontinued.

Second Negative, Ruth Eagleson
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Miss Ryan has stated first of all that because the restriction of agriculture was intended to be lessened as the need lessened, she believes the program has failed, since it has not been greatly reduced.

Now my colleague has already pointed out to you—

and may I repeat—that this program was set up to meet an emergency. Miss Ryan has not taken into consideration the fact that the emergency has not ended. We of the Negative contend that so long as the war lasts abroad, that emergency cannot end. Until we can regain our natural markets abroad on a peace-time basis, we will not have the Affirmative's ideal of a "natural" situation, and we must instead provide some other solution.

Before examining the solution offered by the Affirmative, let us consider the existing program of restricting agriculture to see if the accusations against it are entirely just.

The Affirmative has told you that the program has not actually restricted agriculture because in 1937-38 farmers seeded wheat on more acres than ever before. It is interesting to note that in this year, when control was lessened, the farmer's income fell, according to *New Republic* for May 20, 1940, from $9,116,000,000 in 1937 to $8,081,000,000 in 1938.

This is also evidence of the faulty reasoning which says that a larger crop must be better because more bales bring in more money. Actually, the Affirmative have here again failed to consider the various aspects of the totals they have presented. For though ten eggs, for example, might bring twenty cents and five eggs only fifteen cents, actually the producer who sells his eggs at three cents apiece is earning more from his output. This same, I believe the Affirmative must agree, holds true with cotton and wheat on a large scale.

Now our opponents have gone on to tell you that in

many instances, crop reduction has succeeded in curtailing the acreage planted, but that intensified farming has neutralized this advantage. As my colleague has already stated, this program was never put into effect with the intention of creating a scarcity, but only to control surplus. Agreed, then, that there has been no scarcity of the products restricted, let us consider what might have happened without this controlling measure.

We have already discovered that the United States has lost her agricultural markets abroad—during the wartime at least. The Affirmative have pointed out that during this same period modern development and invention have increased the farmer's efficiency to the point that his production is greater on the same area. In other words, without some control of acreage planting, our surplus problem would not only have been great, but it would have been highly magnified by the fact which the Affirmative has told us is the cause of the maintenance of the production level, in spite of restriction. The problem rests with the Affirmative, we feel, to discover what is to be done with the products raised on the acres now idle. And may we remind the Affirmative that their solution has been simply a continuation of the other aspects of the AAA—the very parts of the AAA which the government has had in the past and at present to supplement with the restriction portion of the Act in order to make it effective.

All this brings us to the problem of providing an alternative plan to take care of the problem which the Affirmative have agreed exists.

What the Affirmative is proposing today is simply to

produce to capacity in every field and then to depend upon our malnourished to consume enough corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco—those products affected by the restriction program—to absorb the surplus.

Idealistically, this seems reasonable—but once again, the Affirmative have become so entranced with large ideas that they have forgotten to consider the individual phases of their proposal. For actually, there are a number of practical objections to this Utopia.

For example, before we consider the problem of consumption, let us examine the production angle. Our opponents have condemned restriction because it means loss of money to many groups—men on WPA, etc. As my colleague has already pointed out, other factors such as increased technological production, are primarily responsible. However, let us just look for a moment at some comparative costs.

As *Business Week* for February 10, 1940 points out, the "stamp plan will not increase the consumption of cotton significantly, as no more than 20% of a dollar is spent for cotton goods and it amounts to that much only in lower grades of goods. At that rate, it will cost the government $250 to move a single bale."

Now Miss Calvin has told us that if the Government does not raise 8,200,000 bales of cotton as proposed, it will cost them $900,000,000. And, if Miss Calvin does raise that surplus of cotton, it not only lowers the price for every cotton raiser in the nation by increasing the surplus problem, but it will cost $1,680,000,000 to move the cotton. This may be an exaggeration of the actual practice in quantity production, but the differ-

ence in costs is large enough to make a significant factor evident—even granting that Miss Calvin's figures which attribute the entire cost of WPA for these particular workers be due to restriction.

Now the Affirmative have further pointed out to us that there is no scarcity of food at the present time. May I in addition suggest that the price of the five staples being restricted is in no way exorbitant and that, as my colleague has demonstrated, many of the people whose diets are not balanced suffer through ignorance rather than through lack of these most common staples. In other words, we of the Negative challenge our opponents to prove that families today are doing without wheat or rice or cotton and still buy any other single article. We believe that these things come first even in the poorest home, and that the only thing which restriction has done is to maintain prices for the farmer—and in so doing, it has accomplished its aim. And my colleague has given you figures to show that the farmer, as *Newsweek,* July 3, 1939, points out, "is much better off than he was in 1932."

Let us briefly, now, consider the plan which the Affirmative have proposed. Miss Ryan has challenged the Negative to prove that today's evils cannot be controlled through a program of crop insurance, soil conservation, distribution of surplus, and a marketing control of surplus. None of these is in any way a provision to take the place of restriction of agriculture, but each is rather designed to supplement it, as the *AAA Handbook* points out. Thus, the Affirmative are not

offering an alternative plan, but rather some aids to the restriction control.

Crop insurance, for example, is designed to protect the farmer against loss of crop by fire, hail, etc.—it actually does nothing to maintain a price level.

Soil conservation is, actually, one of the greatest aims of restriction—and in advocating continuance of soil conservation, the Affirmative are advocating continuance of what the *AAA Handbook* terms the chief aim of restriction of agricultural production.

To be entirely consistent, the Affirmative must either point out to us that restriction of agriculture should not be continued, and thus those sub-marginal lands, and dust areas, etc., should be allowed to again be put into production; or else they must show how they can advocate the maintenance of restriction of these lands and still suggest that the program be abandoned.

But further than this, the Affirmative have suggested a "distribution of surplus." This, I suppose, must mean some sort of plan similar, at least, to the Stamp Plan. And may we point out again that we of the Negative are ready and anxious to see a program of this sort go into effect—as it is doing today—because it in no way affects restriction. The five staple commodities restricted are not those which these families eligible for the Stamp Plan lack. Instead, such a plan gives them vegetables, fruits, etc., varying from time to time. Therefore, it does not alone solve the problem of surpluses which the restriction program is designed to meet.

"A marketing control of surplus," is the Affirmative's final offering, which must pertain in a system such as the "ever-normal granary," which stores surpluses for time of need. Well and good, but this alone the government has already discovered is not enough. It is simply a small part of a great program designed to aid our farmer.

In short, we are not attempting to accuse the Affirmative of proposing plans which will not work. For the Affirmative have taken as their proposal some of the parts of the working whole today. What we are saying, however, is that the solution they have offered is only the fringe of the program being utilized at the present time. We believe in these supplementary aids, but we further believe that without the support of restriction they must fail. Consider, for example, the fact that although all these other programs are operating today, it is necessary to employ restriction to even keep production down to a normal level. Without cutting down through restriction, how would the Affirmative propose to solve the added burden?

In summary, we believe we have met the challenge of the Affirmative and they, instead, must provide an alternative plan to take care of surpluses and maintain prices instead of relying on only a portion of the present program, when they themselves have pointed out that the whole, even with restriction, is no more than adequate.

We believe that the American nation is in no way "paying to starve its citizens," because even the poorest have those commodities which are restricted; and

we believe for these reasons that the accusations of the Affirmative are unfounded and that they themselves, in supporting soil conservation, and the supplementary aids to restriction, must logically realize that they cannot take the prop away from this program so long as our world emergency exists.

First Negative Rebuttal, Elna Schmitz
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You have heard the entire case for both the Affirmative and Negative teams—you have heard reasons for and against the restriction of agricultural production. Let us stop now and weigh, for a moment, these arguments.

The Affirmative have begun by condemning agricultural restriction because it met an abnormally low demand by creating an abnormally low supply. Yet the Affirmative ignored the fact which we have already pointed out—that we are producing these crops during an abnormal period. We of the Negative have already suggested that to return to normal production we must have normal consumption. Yet, here again, the Affirmative ignored the fact which we have already pointed out—that we are producing these crops during an abnormal period. We of the Negative have already suggested that to return to normal production we must have normal consumption. Yet, here again, the Affirmative ignored this aspect; and, instead, insisted that they could artificially increase consumption (as has never been done in the past), by causing the American

people to eat not only as much as they consume in prosperous years, but in addition to eat as much as the rest of the world normally imports from us, and after that to eat—for dessert, we suppose—as much more as farmers, with improved methods of farming, can manage to raise! What an idea!

The Affirmative offered a several-fold plan. My colleague has just pointed out to you how each aspect of this plan, with the exception of feeding, rather, stuffing, the American public, was in no sense a method of maintaining prices or replacing the benefits of restriction. The Affirmative must agree that these aspects are supplementary parts of the present AAA program—some of which, as soil conservation, are actually phases of restriction. Until the Affirmative can offer some proof, at least, that these supplements will take the place of restriction, let us agree that they will not, and go on to the one suggestion made by our opponents. This, feeding our needy, has already been discussed at some length, but may I briefly summarize it. The single argument in favor of the prospects of absorbing the huge surplus which increased acreage production must create, was presented by pointing out that some of our fellowmen are malnourished. Nor have the Affirmative denied that this could well be due to ignorance rather than want. They cannot well deny this, for they must realize, as we do, that none of the agricultural products being restricted today is exhorbitant in price. None, in fact, is beyond the monetary reach of even the poorer families. We, therefore, once more challenge the Affirmative to point out to us they can

force these people to eat more wheat, rice, corn, etc., when these products are reasonably priced at the present time, and must, certainly, be found first on the list of any family desiring them. Would the Affirmative propose to lower the price of these commodities still further? And if that is done, who bears the burden? The farmer? Or the taxpayer, through subsidies?

In other words, the Affirmative are not solving the situation by paying the farmer in some other way, nor have they pointed out satisfactorily how they will increase consumption. The stamp plan?—we have shown how it deals mainly with fresh fruits, vegetables—a method of distributing surplus commodities which people do need, and not those which are already available to these people.

Thus far, we see that the Affirmative are condemning a system which has, as they admit, reduced acreage—and by pointing out to us that each acre can now, through better farming methods, raise more crops—they are pointing out that this program is also reducing crop production. Successful, then, in this regard. Until the Affirmative shows us how their plan can increase consumption of restricted products—products of which any family can have a sufficiency at present price levels—the Affirmative have not provided either a condemnation of the present working system, or an alternative plan.

In condemning crop control, Miss Ryan accused the program of tending to become permanent. "A 9-year program," she termed it, "which after 5 years allowed

more wheat to be seeded (in 1937) than ever before." May I point out to Miss Ryan that the present program, embodying the many aspects which she has approved, as well as the restriction, has been in operation not quite four years. For 1937 was the year in which, as Miss Calvin pointed out, the old plan was done away with, and Congress did not pass the new act until so late that fall that restriction for 1937 was not carried out. In other words, it was not in spite of restriction that more acres were seeded, but because there was no restriction. And we have already seen that the farmer's income went sharply down that year. This leaves the Affirmative with the obvious question . . . will they face the danger of repeating this same calamity?

But we have not completely answered the challenge of "permanent program." Let me remind Miss Ryan that this program proposes to fill the gap caused by our loss of foreign markets and by unnatural world conditions . . . and that it is evident that so long as these phases exist, and only that long, will we need this plan, and the lesson 1937 taught us.

In short, we of the Negative believe that the Affirmative's accusations against the present system of restriction of agriculture have not only been unjust but somewhat hasty, in that they have not solved the problem which cessation of this restriction would create; and in that they are agreeing major portions of it (soil conservation and idleness of sub-marginal land), are desirable. Although they have accused the plan of failing, we have seen that it has kept down surplus, main-

tained a price level, met an emergency need, increased the income of the farmer, and in no way interfered with maximum consumption by poorer families should they desire wheat, corn, rice, cotton, or tobacco.

For these reasons, we accuse the Affirmative of not facing the problem at hand; of unjustly condemning crop control, and of not supplying an alternative but rather only giving us a supplementary aid. For these reasons, furthermore, we of the Negative stand resolved that the governmental restriction of agricultural production should not end so long as the world emergency exists.

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Velma Calvin
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As my colleague and I have been pointing out thus far in this debate, restriction has failed to meet its own aims. It has failed to raise the farmers' income proportionately with other incomes, and the increase that has occurred is a natural rise as all incomes were increasing during those periods.

My colleague, Miss Ryan, has also pointed out that, for example, in cotton the production increased under restriction.

Since restriction has failed in its chief aims and has brought new evils there will be no difficulty in doing away with the restriction. It will not leave the farmer in a chaotic state as the first Negative speaker would have you believe.

This brings us to the point on soil conservation. The

Negative have told us the advantages and needs for soil conservation, and we of the Affirmative agree with them whole-heartedly. We do not propose to do away with soil conservation payments. We are not advocating the abolishment of the AAA, but only the abolishment of restriction, because of its failure and added evils. Thus we see that the farmer or the American people will not be made to suffer discontinuance of soil conservation. This part of the AAA will continue but restriction will be discontinued.

Sub-marginal lands will not be an increased problem when we do away with restriction. At the present time much of this sub-marginal land has been bought and put into permanent advantageous uses such as National Game Reserves, as was done in South-Eastern Washington.

It is also true that under restriction parts of good land as well as parts of poor land were restricted. Therefore, the sub-marginal land problem was not handled desirably under restriction.

We find that if we do away with restriction, we can handle these sub-marginal lands problem more adequately. The sub-marginal lands will be forced out of farming when we return to fair competition, and do away with the evil of monopoly which the Government has tried to create under restriction.

Thus we see that without restriction sub-marginal lands will not be a problem. Some sections are in other advantageous uses now, and some would be better off if forced out of use by competition.

Under the plan of the Negative, we are attempting to

support the same number of people on farms as we did before technological improvements. We are trying to make a monopoly and subsidize these farmers with the taxpayers' money. We should look forward instead. Take advantage of these technological improvements. Let a smaller number of farmers raise our food and not support agriculture according to a subsidy plan as the Negative are proposing to continue.

Thus we see that our farm problem should be allowed to work itself out on sound economical basis and discontinue restriction of agricultural production.

Second Negative Rebuttal, Ruth Eagleson
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The first Affirmative speaker has told you that restriction of agricultural production should be done away with because it has failed to meet its own aims. If, in our last Negative speech, we can prove to you that restriction is doing what it set out to do, then the Affirmative must agree that restriction, by their terms, is successful.

First, Miss Calvin has condemned restriction because it failed to raise the farmers' income proportionately with other incomes—and yet we have seen that it was only because the surplus was controlled that a price level was maintained at all—that it was only because surplus was controlled that the farmer could sell his products at an amount enabling him to maintain his income in a rising scale with other incomes. Consider, instead, what would have happened

had acreage production been increased during this time, and had each acre raised, as the Affirmative maintain, a larger crop than in former years! Instead of a rising income, we should have had a highly magnified problem.

Then Miss Calvin pointed out that in some instances crop control had failed to restrict the surplus—that more cotton, for example, was raised. Yet the Affirmative have given you the reason for this—as the Negative, too, have pointed out technological improvements have made it possible for the farmer to raise more on each acre of his land. Once again, consider how greatly increased this problem would have been *without* restriction.

Restriction has not, we thus see, failed in the chief aims attributed to it by the Affirmative. It follows, according to Miss Calvin's reasoning, that there will be difficulty in doing away with the present program. And even if it were not accomplishing all that it set out to do, we of the Negative challenge the Affirmative to prove that a sudden cessation of crop restriction would not harm those farmers who depend upon payments, and who can sell their goods at higher prices because the price level is maintained.

Miss Calvin has raised an interesting point in telling you that the Affirmative propose to continue soil conservation, but not to continue restriction. Now the Affirmative, we believe, must agree that soil conservation is restriction of agriculture whenever a farmer, co-operating with the Government, does not raise crops on land which formerly bore crops. And in many in-

stances, soil conservation takes this form. Therefore, in an effort to side-step a part of restriction which even the Affirmative must agree is good, our opponents have attempted to incorporate it into their plan and not admit its basic aspect—restriction of agricultural production. We of the Negative maintain that by agreeing to this phase, the Affirmative are agreeing to the admitted benefits of at least a part of the present working program of restriction.

Now, the first Affirmative speaker has gone on to tell us that those farmers on sub-marginal land will be forced out of production, that we should "let less farmers raise our food." And the first Affirmative speaker spent a great portion of her time in her constructive speech worrying about the people whom restriction would put out of work. Yet Miss Calvin's plan is to return to "fair competition." In other words, each farmer is to raise as much as he can, and to sell for what he can—and the devil take the hindmost! In our modern America, we believe this plan is not only out of date, but impractical . . . for the reasons which we have reiterated throughout this debate. Miss Calvin has ignored such points as the problem of increasing consumption of the staples which are already available at economy prices. She has ignored the problem of raising more and still maintaining prices, while we have lost our foreign markets. How can our farmer problem "work itself out" as the Affirmative advocate, until the Affirmative can restore normal times for a normal solution.

Until such time, then, as the Affirmative can solve

the additional problems which they are placing upon agricultural America, if they discontinue restriction, we of the Negative are firmly against such a proposal. We have not seen the Affirmative solve the problems they themselves have raised: more people out of work (through competition which is to do away with the sub-marginal farmers), a far greater surplus, including all that was raised in normal times and consumed by America in such quantity as she desired (for the prices of these products where never unreasonably high) and a surplus including what Europe formerly consumed, as well as the great additional amount which is being raised on each acre of land, as the Affirmative have pointed out and which will be intensified by putting more acres into production. Until such time, then, as the Affirmative can solve the additional problems which they are placing upon agricultural America, if they discontinue restriction, we of the Negative are firmly against such a proposal.

We have not seen the Affirmative solve the problem of continuing restriction of agriculture for the purpose of soil conservation, yet in the next breath advocating that restriction be done away with.

We have not seen the Affirmative satisfactorily contend that restriction has failed to meet the emergencies which must be faced today . . . and which the Affirmative, on the other hand, have not met. For the restriction program, may I once again point out; maintained prices by controlling surplus, and increased farmers' income. In addition the program has cut down acreage, and thus controlled the surplus by cut-

ting off those crops which would otherwise have been raised there, and which were no longer needed, due not only to the world conditions, but to the increased technological production. Other than these, the speaker who just left the floor did not object to the program of restriction in use today.

For these reasons, then, we of the Negative believe that restriction is not only a satisfactory measure as it is being practised today, it is accomplishing its aims, but that the Affirmative have failed to solve their own problems, namely to set up a program which could meet the greater problems incurred by doing away with a controlled production for a lessened market, and replacing it with a "raise-more" program.

We of the Negative, therefore, stand resolved that restriction of agricultural production should not be discontinued.

Affirmative Rebuttal, Shirley Ryan
Washington State College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: A national policy is not beneficial unless it can succeed ultimately. We of the Affirmative are of the opinion that a plan which is not presently successful, a plan that has failed during the nine years it has operated would necessarily fail miserably the longer it is in practice. Its downfall would be even greater than that of a policy which would be in accord with the conditions of the times.

Weighing the two cases as presented thus far, it is evident that the two sides are agreed upon certain

points, mainly: that the AAA has many benefits, such as soil conservation, attempts at increased agriculture, and the achievement of a balanced agriculture. We differ, then, upon the question of restriction of agricultural production.

Miss Eagleson has told us that their plan of restriction is merely one of emergency. And yet she has contradicted herself to tell us that the reason for a decrease in wages in 1937 was the lifting of the crop restrictions. We fail to see that this year (in comparison with depression years and years of the world conflict) was one of emergency. If the plan is only temporary, then it should not be necessary to have it in a year when no emergency exists. And yet, according to our opponents it was needed in 1937. To quote Miss Eagleson, "the emergency has not ended."

We have quoted figures to prove that the farmer's income did not increase in proportion to the prices he had to pay for his products. These figures are for the years up until 1939, not wartime figures, not emergency-period figures.

The last speaker has told us that technological improvements, soil conservation, and other conditions have helped agriculture considerably. The Negative have told us further that the recession of 1937, the emergency of the time, the lowering of prices which the Affirmative have quoted, and the increased production, are all existent because of the abnormal conditions. And yet their plan is ostensibly designed to function in just such a period. How are we to believe that a policy

of restriction will alleviate these evils if it does not accomplish its primary purpose.

Obviously, we of the Affirmative realize that it would be quite impossible to continue increased production unless the consumption could be increased. And yet, as we have pointed out, the millions of dollars of subsidies which go to farmers each year for not producing, could go to the consumer, and thus attack the problem in the only economically sound way.

As we have shown you, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is constructed to meet this very problem. In its first year of existence, alone, millions of dollars worth of commodities were distributed to the needy. Is it not sensible to distribute the surplus rather than pay a farmer not to produce it?

The Negative has further contended that the policy of restriction has not been responsible for all unemployment. If, however, its discontinuance will solve a small part of the unemployment problem, we of the Affirmative feel it is worthwhile. Finally, let us see what the policy of agricultural restriction has accomplished.

It was designed to decrease the surplus. We of the Affirmative have not only proved that this end was not accomplished, but we have gone further to show you that had it been accomplished, it would have been undesirable.

The policy intended to conserve the soil. We have shown you that the soil conservation program is adequate without a policy of restriction, and that the re-

striction has caused farmers to wear out lands over-planting.

The program was designed to raise the farmer's income. Our opponents have attributed any decrease to the conditions of the times and any increase to their policy of restriction. This is difficult to imagine as the whole truth. We have proved that the money given in subsidy could have been used to much better advantage by a promotion of increased consumption.

Let us see for a moment what further evils have been incurred. Wealth is being destroyed. The farmer's morale is lowered by the subsidies. The program is much too expensive. It is an emergency measure which, as the Negative have admitted, cannot be repealed in normal times. This is not consistent with their other arguments.

Because we of the Affirmative are agreed with the Negative that the major issues of the AAA are working satisfactorily, and because we have shown you that the policy of restriction has not accomplished its aims, we stand resolved that the policy of restriction of agricultural production should be discontinued.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
THE FEDERAL POLICY OF RESTRICTING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Books and Pamphlets

U.S. Government.—*Rural Relief and Recovery*. Social Problems No. 3. 26 pp. Supt. of Documents. Gov't Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1939.

Dept. of Agriculture.—*AAA Publications.* Supt. of Documents. Gov't. Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
Year Book of Agriculture. 1940.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

Annals of the American Academy.—211:27-34, September, 1940. *American Farmer Looks Abroad.* L. A. Wheeler.
Business Week.—P. 22, October 7, 1939. *Farm Income Goes Up.* P. 17-18, July 8, 1939. *Farm Aid Hits Big Figure.* P. 16-18, November 18, 1939. *Drought Strikes the Plains Again.* P. 15, February 10, 1940. *House Passes Buck on Farm Cuts.*
Christian Science Monitor.—P. 3, August 17, 1940. *Blue Stamps for Supper.*
Commonweal.—32:143-146, June 7, 1940. *It's Up to the Farmer.* Thomas J. Stamm.
Fortune.—22:68-9, July, 1940. *Agricultural Policy and National Welfare.* Fortune Round Table.
Harper's.—179:595-96, November, 1939. *The Industrial Revolution Hits the Farmer.* Peter F. Drucker.
Independent Woman.—19:194-96, July, 1940. *What Shall We Do About Agriculture?* H. A. Wallace, Arthur Capper.
Journal of Political Economy.—46:305-23, June, 1938. *The Maintenance of Agricultural Production During Depression.* Galbraith and Black.
Monthly Labor Review.—49:292-293, August, 1939. *Productivity of Farm Labor, 1909-1938.*
Nation's Business.—28:30, July, 1939. *Private Enterprise Lends Aid to Free Distribution.* 26:38-40, March, 1938. *Farm Income—the Tie that Binds.*
New Republic.—102:535, April 22, 1940. *Flirting with Depression.* J. T. Flynn.
Newsweek.—12:45-46, November 14, 1938. *Farm Outlook.* 12:42-43, October 24, 1938. *Consumer Subsidy.* 16:36, December 23, 1940; *Dark Picture on Parity Issue Painted at Baltimore Convention.*
New York Times Magazine.—P. 10-11, 16, June, 1940. *In Place of Surpluses—Food Stamps.*
New York Times Magazine.—P. 6, 19, May 5, 1940. *Wanted: a Master Conservation Plan.* Henry Wallace.

Reader's Digest.—32:1-4, May, 1938. *That Man is Forgotten Again.* John T. Flynn. 35:92-95, Sept. 1939. *White-collar Farmers.* Ralph Wallace.

Rotarian.—56:22-23, May, 1940. *Fix U.S. Farm Prices.* J. N. Dyer, C. J. Claasen.

Saturday Evening Post.—212:60, March 2, 1940. *The A.A.A. in its Own Dust Bowl.* Garet Garrett. 211:11, 70. June 24, 1939. *Give Us This Day.* Garet Garrett. 209:14-15, May 8, 1937. *That Ever Normal Granary.* J. E. Boyle.

Scholastic.—35:13-14, Dec. 11, 1939. *Want in the Midst of Plenty.* Frank B. Latham.

Survey.—76:201-02, Je. 1940. *Blue Stamp Year.*

Vital Speeches.—6:228; Feb. 1, 1940. *Agricultural and Trade Agreements.* H. Wallace. 6:232-33. Feb. 1, 1940. *Reciprocal Trade Agreements.* Arthur Capper. 6:756-59. Oct. 1, 1940. *Ever Normal Poverty. Position of the Farmer Today.* C. L. McNary. 5:344-47. Mar. 15, 1939. *Agriculture, Industry, and Labor.* Charles R. Hook. 5:535-39. Je. 15, 1939. *Expanding Consumption of Agricultural Products.* J. Frank Grimes. 5:154-57. Dec. 15, 1938. *Common and Conflicting Interests of Farmers and Industrial Labor.* Henry Wallace.

POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE INCREASED

A Radio Debate

IOWA STATE COLLEGE AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* DRAKE UNIVERSITY NEGATIVE

For ten years or more Drake University and Iowa State College have held an annual debate over Radio Station WOI on the national high school debate subject for the benefit of Iowa high schools. This year the debate was held on January 8, 1941 on the 1940-41 debate subject which was: *Resolved: that the power of the Federal Government should be increased.* Station WOI is operated by the Extension department of Iowa State College at Ames, Iowa, and follows a policy of presenting student work in original writing, group discussion, and in drama every other Friday at 4 P. M. during the college season. The debate presented here is a part of this annual program.

The national high school subject provoked considerable adverse comment during the season because of the term "power" used in the statement of the question. The present debate gives an interesting attempt to evade the technical definition of the term, which strictly interpreted refers only to "power" as delegated in the Federal Constitution. The Affirmative here chose "practical power as used" rather than technical or legal delegation of authority, an interpretation used in the debate, *Reducing the Power of the Federal Government,* in Volume XXI *Intercollegiate Debates* issued last fall.

The manuscript of this debate was submitted to *Intercollegiate Debates* for publication by Prof. Wm. Justus Wilkinson, Director of Debate at Iowa State College.

POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE INCREASED

First Affirmative, Josephine Elwood
Iowa State College

FRIENDS: Sometime in our lives we all come in contact with the power of the Federal Government. Simple every day experiences like mailing letters, buying cigarettes or gasoline bring us under its influence. Now perhaps as we first think of this question we would answer it "No," but after more consideration we must conclude that if this nation is to continue to expand, then the powers of the Federal Government must be increased.

Since the adoption of our Federal Constitution this nation has had agricultural, industrial, and commercial development never before equaled in history. Even though this development was not anticipated by the framers of our Constitution, the power of the Federal Government has increased as the nation has expanded. Now by increase we mean an extension, an expansion, or a further development of something which already exists. In other words, the increase of the power of the Federal Government is an enlargement or increase to broaden the already existing scope of federal powers.

There are three ways in which the power of the Federal Government can be increased: first, by federal statutory enactment such as the abandonment of the

gold standard in 1933; second, by constitutional amendment as in the case of the income tax; and, third, by judicial construction which is the interpretation of the Supreme Court which gives the Federal Government extended powers from some existing constitutional provision. Over half of the federal powers already obtained have been created by judicial construction. For example, Chief Justice Marshall ruled that under the power to coin money and regulate its value, the United States Government had the right to establish national banks; although, the Constitution doesn't even mention them. Since that interpretation, under this same constitutional provision, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Production Credit Corporation, and many other federal financial institutions have been established, all of which has proved indispensable in times of depression and a necessity in times of prosperity.

Now we advocate an increase in federal powers in order to foster technological development, economic security, and national unity.

The framers of our Constitution could not forsee the development of the N.B.C. networks, the Bell Telephone Company, the Western Union Telegraph Company, the United Airlines, or our modern streamlined trains; but by judicial construction Congress has been given power to regulate them insofar as their operations are between the states. Now if television is to be developed as foreseen, and assuming that there may be interferences as in the field of radio, should not the

Federal Government have power to regulate it and make its results beneficial to us all?

In order to prevent recurring depressions, governmental planning is necessary. In other words, if we farmers are to keep the price of our corn from going as low as 12 cents a bushel we must have a definite economic plan. This is to be achieved only by increasing federal powers so that the Government may control to a greater extent agricultural and industrial production. In a nation which can be agriculturally and industrially independent there is no excuse for one-third of the people being ill-clothed, ill-housed and ill-fed.

Even though you do not agree with the present federal farm program you must realize that there will be no true prosperity until the farmer receives a fair price for his commodities. The Federal Government does and should protect labor by minimum wage and hour laws; also the Federal Government should be given additional power to insure economic security for the farmer.

If we are to have national unity the Federal Government should have power over all commerce in the states as well as between the states instead of just interstate commerce as is now the case. For instance, close to the border of Minnesota there are numerous small produce plants. Some are located completely within the State of Minnesota while others are just across the line in Iowa. Minnesota plants buying and selling wholly within the State of Minnesota, where they ship to the Twin Cities' market, are so operated that they do not fall within the Wagner Labor Act or the Child Labor

Act, but the Iowa plants which also buy and sell in Minnesota must comply with these federal statutes while the Minnesota plants evade complying with social benefit legislation, which has been strongly approved by the people of the United States.

You who travel on the highways know how much is shipped by motor vehicle, and you realize that there is a great need for uniform traffic and safety regulations. Is there any fair reason why one state should make a truck display several lamps of various colors in particular places while another state into which this same truck may pass will prohibit the use of such lights so arranged?

The divorce mill in Reno is a disgrace to the nation. We need uniform marriage and divorce laws. Our tax laws vary so among the different states that they hinder interstate commerce. Some states have many large corporations while other states have none because the corporation laws vary so among the states. This lack of uniformity makes existing laws difficult to enforce.

In this Gasoline Age there is little room for laws which were made to suit the horse and buggy. If the United States is to maintain its position as a leading nation we must increase the power of the Federal Government to control new developments and to meet growing needs. Additional federal power is needed to assure technological development, economic security and national unity; therefore, the power of the Federal Government must be increased.

First Negative, Anne Vrooman
Drake University

FRIENDS OF RADIO-LAND: It is agreed that we of the United States of America love democracy. We take pride in the fact that our nation is closer to democracy than any other country in the world. Our pride is inherited from those who have gone before us. It was imbedded in them, and in the ideals which they founded, developed, and for which they struggled. To most of us, the preservation of a democratic government is very much desired. For most of us, it would be only with utmost reluctance that we would be willing to yield up our system of government for another.

We can conceive of three types of national government, two of which the United States of America has employed.

The first of these is a confederation. This is a form wherein the national government is the agent of the states, and subject to them. In a complex state, this system of government is impracticable as demonstrated by the thirteen original colonies during the so-called "Critical Period" under the Articles of Confederation. The second type of government which has been employed by the United States of America and is now in effect is the federation type, wherein the states relinquish certain delegated powers, such as the power to wage war and make peace, control of interstate commerce, and the control of money, and still maintain the whole body of powers and functions within their individual state governments. It is only

with reluctance that a freedom-loving people delegate powers to a far-distant centralized government, and this is rightly so. The citizens of the thirteen original states in their colonial days knew this fact only too well through the introduction of such legislation as the Stamp Act, Sedition Laws, etc., by the far-distant government of England. In the federal system such as we have at the present time in the United States, certain powers have to be delegated to the central government in order to carry out governmental functions which the individual states cannot handle alone—powers dealing with such obviously national functions as war and peace, money, and interstate trade. These powers were outlined in the Federal Constitution and have been developed through the course of the years, with many much needed social reforms only coming into full bloom since 1933.

However, the thirteen original colonies knew the folly of delivering themselves into the hands of a national government having unlimited powers. Thomas Jefferson knew this. All of our Founding Fathers knew this, and shed blood in defense of the principle of limited national government. During the years of the development of this nation, both powers and functions of the national government and powers and function of state governments have increased with the expansion of the nation; in recent years, particularly since 1933, the scope of national powers was obtained due to the financial disaster of 1929, and the terrible depression that followed. Under the circumstances, the bodily taking over by the national government of

powers formerly exercised within the states was necessary to bring about some degree of order and efficiency. Does it follow, however, that the emergency abrogation of state powers by the Federal Government means that the doctrine of states' rights should be destroyed? The Affirmative in urging, at this stage of the game, that the powers of the Federal Government be increased, is opposing the doctrine of states rights and hence opposing the principle upon which the Federation of States was founded. Let us see why this must follow. The point of departure from the federal system of government to the third conceivable type of national government, that is a unitary system, which is used by the Nazis and the Fascists, has now been reached. Such a system of government directly opposes the federal plan: all powers are vested in a central government, the other governments acting merely as agents in its administration.

Now the Affirmative advocates an even greater extension of federal control. They have pinned this control down to that of closer regulation of interstate commerce—to the extent, in fact, of controlling intrastate commerce—commerce within the state themselves. Let us see just what such control would mean to the several states. We would have the Federal Government telling us how wide our streets and highways must be in town and country; how long, where they will be located, how they must be lighted and patrolled; what vehicles will travel them, what these vehicles will convey; tonnage rates—and so on—to an absurd and ridiculous point. We would become, merely, the citi-

zens of a huge territory wherein state boundaries would mean absolutely nothing and over which one far distant government would assume authority and exercise control. The very distance of some states from the seat of the central government would create a fantastic and impossible situation. In short, we would cease to acknowledge the existence of separate states and hence the existence of both a Federation of States and the Federal Constitution.

Of course we must meet new developments in a rapidly changing world and expand in accordance with them. But we must not destroy the very principle of states' rights that makes a greater expansion and development of our nation possible. We must preserve and protect the existing powers of the state governments if we are to maintain a democratic Federation of States.

Second Affirmative, Richard Mason
Iowa State College

FRIENDS: From Miss Vrooman's remarks you might have drawn the conclusion that Miss Elwood and I are advocating some form of totalitarian government. This is a false impression. We advocate no form of unitary government, as the Drake University debaters define it.

We too love democracy; but, like a parent who loves his child, we endeavor to see and understand the faults of democracy and do what we can to correct them and

make democracy even more meaningful than it is at present.

Many Americans publicly give lip service to democracy, but we of the Affirmative propose to make democracy more active by advocating an increase in federal powers, which in the case of extended federal control over intrastate commerce would bring the benefits of social legislation to many thousands who now do not have them.

You will remember Miss Elwood explained to you how social legislation is withheld from employees in Minnesota produce plants which buy and sell wholly within the state. This is because the legislation applies only to concerns engaged in interstate commerce. We propose to extend federal control to commerce within states as well as between states so that these benefits may be enjoyed by all workers.

Miss Vrooman's opinions about intrastate commerce are shown in these statements of hers. She said, "We would have the Federal Government telling us how wide our streets and highways must be, how long, what vehicles will travel them, what these vehicles will convey, tonnage rates—and so on to an absurd and ridiculous point." Now why is it objectionable to have standard sized highways? Surely if more standard traffic regulations were enforced in the various forty-eight states fewer accidents due to strange laws would be the result. Also, we think that it would be desirable for the Federal Government to determine where these roads should be. This would prevent corrupt practices such as those in the state of Louisiana a few

years ago. It is said that the Louisiana machine would punish those who disagreed with them by refusing to pave the highways in front of their homes, even though in some cases the funds for road building were supplied by the Federal Government. The fact remains, that the same people are affected whether it is by commerce within the state or commerce between the states. Does it hurt any less to be hit by an Iowa truck than it does to be hit by a truck from Illinois?

It is plain that the Negative is insisting on the ancient states' rights question to shield the fact that they have no objections to our statements that economic security and national unity can be gained by increasing the power of the Federal Government.

You will remember Miss Vrooman said, "—in recent years the scope of the national powers was obtained due to the financial disaster of 1929 and the terrible depression that followed. Under the circumstances, the bodily taking over of powers formerly exercised within the states by the national government was necessary to bring about some degree of order and efficiency." If that was true in 1932 surely they will admit that the national government can accomplish the same thing now in our present national crisis.

We repeat that in order to prevent recurring depressions governmental planning is necessary. If we are to stabilize prices and construct some beneficial form of distribution, we must have a definite economic plan. For example, if we are to prevent corn from going to 12 cents a bushel and at the same time take care of one-third of our people who are ill-fed, we must

bring some degree of efficiency into our economic system. If we are to prevent cotton from going to 3 or 4 cents a pound and at the same time find clothes for one-third of our people who are ill-clothed, we must have economic planning.

Another of Miss Vrooman's statements is, "—it is with reluctance that a freedom-loving people delegate powers to a far distant centralized government." Well, in the face of modern conditions we believe that far-distant as used by the lady must refer to colonial conditions. In George Washington's day it used to take 28 days to travel from Boston to Philadelphia in a stage coach. Today anyone can reach Washington, D. C., in 16 hours by plane from as far as Seattle, Washington.

The most glaring inconsistency lies in these two ideas given us by Miss Vrooman in these statements. First, she says that we have such a far-flung country that centralized control would be impossible and fantastic because of the great distances involved. Second, she says we will have a strong unitary form of government with a rigid central control like that the Nazis and Fascists enforce. If the first statement were true, we never need fear a totalitarian government; and, if the second were true, the first could not be right.

The Negative speaker says, "—during the years of the development of this nation both powers and functions of the national and state governments have increased with the expansion of the nation." And again she says, "—we must meet new developments in a rapidly changing world and expand in accordance with

them." And that, in the words of Miss Vrooman, is exactly what the Affirmative is proposing. The increases of federal power in the last 161 years have not so far led us to a unitary form of government. And by the same parallel, why will the increases in power that we are proposing now lead to a form of unitary government.

We advocate an increase in federal powers in order to foster technological development, economic security and national unity. If we are sincere in making America an active democracy such conditions as one-third of our people being ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed must be changed. We must strive for economic security for all, not for just the few. This is to be achieved only by increasing federal powers so that the Government may control to a greater extent agricultural and industrial production and distribution.

Additional federal power is needed to assure technological development, economic security and national unity; therefore, the power of the Federal Government must be increased.

Second Negative, Raymond Restione
Drake University

FRIENDS: It is my peculiar province as last speaker of the Negative to survey the debate as it has been presented thus far and to attempt to draw some conclusions at which we may logically arrive. The Affirmative has advocated an increase of the federal powers in order to foster technological development, economic

security, and national unity. This phrase seems to be the keynote of the Affirmative debate. Our opponents have told us that an increase in federal powers is necessary if our country is to expand. We of the Negative agree that the present set-up is not perfect, but we disagree with the Affirmative as to the best method of amending or alleviating these faults. My colleague has shown you that our Government was formed so as to centralize as little power in the Federal Government as consistent with security and union, and to give as such much power to the states and people. She has shown you that the underlying principle determining the distribution of power and responsibility in our governmental structure was the principle of de-centralization. The Affirmative have failed to reply to our point. Our opponents have contradicted my colleague's charges that an increase in federal powers would lead to a unitarian government as we define it. We challenge him to give us his definition of a unitarian form of government and challenge him to show that it is contrary to our view of the matter. We heartily reject the unitarian idea for it is the direct antithesis of the democratic scheme of life.

Mr. Mason says, "The increases in federal power in one hundred and sixty-one years has not, so far, led us to a unitary form of government and why should the present proposal increase lead to this form of government."

We did not have a policy of centralization one hundred and sixty-one years ago nor do we have it today. Our government has assumed changes, amendments

have been added to the Constitution and governmental activities enlarged. Yet, of the first nineteen amendments only two tended to centralize power in the Federal Government. Surely, the Affirmative can not construe this as a reversal of our original policy of decentralization. The Affirmative point to the enlargement of federal activities within the last few decades. We are cognizant of this fact. But, so have the activities of the state governments increased. Even city governments carry on a maze of functions which were unknown a generation ago. All of which means that the scope of government itself is enlarging, not that there is any undesirable shift of power from one unit to the next. We are not debating an increase in scope, but an increase in power. Let us examine the question of political unity. If it is stability that our apponents want, then why not go all the way and have the most stable of all governments, an absolute monarchy. Stability in government does not necessarily mean national unity. National unity cannot be had by making one unit of our government stronger than the other. An increase of federal powers is bound to take away some of the powers of the states and the people. With this power partially taken away from the people, how can national unity as we know it in a democracy be achieved? Unless we place power and responsibility close to the people, you will create indifference and irresponsibility.

Our opponents have maintained that an increase of federal powers would foster economic security. Past experiences shows the exact opposite to be true. In the

U.S.A. each extension of government control results in decrease in efficiency and an increase of productive costs. Federal operation of railroads during the first World War resulted in a deficit of more than a billion dollars, although rates were increased 50%; control of prices and production by the War Industries Board was accompanied by increases in prices averaging more than 100%; control of industry under the N.R.A. was accompanied by price increases in virtually every field of production. Yet the members of the Affirmative argue that stability of prices will ensue if federal powers are increased. Where the government agencies have been given the duty of long range planning, re-results have been equally unsatisfactory. Control of the agricultural production by the AAA has made little effect upon the size of agricultural surplus and has failed to bring the farmer the desired parity price in spite of the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars from the public treasury each year. I believe that these statements disprove the Affirmative's contention that an increase of federal powers would be a definite boon to economic security.

In the plan proposed, governmental planning is endorsed. Governmental planning means restriction of industry. This is not the solution to the problem, for today we have governmental planning and by using the figures so kindly given to us by our worthy opponents one-third of the nation is ill-housed, ill-fed and ill-clothed. Industry operates with greater efficiency when freed from government interference than it could under federal control. The Affirmative have asked us

whether the Federal Government should have the power to regulate new technological developments? May we reply with another question? Should we abandon our traditional economic system of free competition and private enterprise in favor of one based upon federal planning and more or less rigorous federal control of all economic activities?

The Affirmative said that they wanted the Federal Government to control intra as well as interstate commerce. My colleague has already dealt with this and I would like to add: We believe that the Federal Government is already over-burdened with domestic and foreign affairs. We feel that the problems of intrastate and interstate commerce could be ironed out in other ways. We suggest close co-operation of the states; secondly, an advancement of the Governors' Conference Movement; or third, by interstate compacts. We contend that an increase of federal powers to control state commerce is unnecessary and unsound. We have already shown that the Federal Government is not too efficient in solving various problems. We also contend that the afore-mentioned bodies would be better suited to do the work or provide solutions as they could concentrate solely on the problems of intrastate and interstate commerce.

We might mention corruption, extravagance and inefficiency which result from such over-centralization as the Affirmative advocate. May we quote Calvin Coolidge, "If the authority of the states were struck down, disorder approaching chaos would be on us in 24 hours. No plan of centralization has ever been

adopted which did not result in bureaucracy, tyranny, inflexibility, or decline of all forms of government."

We have tried to show you that the Affirmative's main contention, namely, that an increase of federal powers will foster economic security, technological development, and national unity is illogical. We have shown that first the Federal Government does not necessarily have to control state commerce and secondly, that the Federal Government is already overburdened. My colleague has shown you all the new problems that it would have to face if this increase were to take place. The Negative has tried to show that the Federal Government has not always met with complete success in past experiences. We have analyzed the proposed plan and have shown that it is impractical. We have rejected the plan from the outset because it destroys the balance of power between the State and Federal Government. In view of this evidence we find it compulsory to reject the Affirmative proposal.

Affirmative Rebuttal, Josephine Elwood
Iowa State College

FRIENDS: Our opponents' argument may be summed up as merely opposition to an assumed centralization of power at Washington. Both the Negative and Affirmative agree that we need to foster technological development, economic security, and national unity; and the Affirmative contends that this can be done only through an increase in the powers of the Federal Government.

It is true that of the first nineteen amendments only two gave more power to the Federal Government, yet this is a minor way of increasing federal powers. By far the most important method is by judicial interpretation of federal statutes. The power of the Federal Government has increased continuously during the past one hundred and sixty-one years and will continue to increase.

Our opponents say we are not debating an increase in scope, but an increase in power. One hundred and sixty-one years ago there were no automobiles and few overland transportation routes and the traffic problem was practically non-existent. Today with one auto for every four people in the United States a new problem has arisen, and, therefore, the Government has made traffic laws. In so doing they have widened their scope of action and they have increased their power. It is only logical to say that an increase in scope must include increase in power.

This increase of power will not lead to the unitary form of government the Negative fears because the assumption that power will be centralized in Washington is wrong. Local officials in your own town will administer these federal regulations without causing the inconveniences and confusion that would result from varying legislation enacted by different states.

Federal courts, which now exist in every state, as well as state courts, could enforce these laws. In other words the laws increasing the powers are enacted by your representatives sent by you to Washington, but are brought home to you to be enforced. For example,

the United States now provides labor relation boards which come to the seat of trouble to make decisions such as the one that settled the Maytag strike in Newton, Iowa, two years ago. Federal highways in Iowa are built through the Iowa Highway Commission here in Ames. There is a remedy to be had in your own state for every wrong that results from federal law, and greater benefits will result from having uniform laws throughout the several states.

We agree that close co-operation among the states is necessary to iron out many of our existing problems, but why shouldn't our senators and representatives do this for us in Congress instead of complicating matters by giving more powers to our Governors? Our Congressmen can better promote national unity than can our Governors.

Every fair minded citizen knows that the Government operating railroads during the World War is an unfair example of the government's ability to plan business. It was a time of emergency and no private individual firm or corporation could have done as well. We offset this example with that of the postoffice service of the United States. Would you want to let private concerns handle the mails? To argue that the *laissez faire* system of government should prevail is to argue that we need no further regulations in industry. That same argument has been used throughout the history of the United States. Would you say the railroads and railroad rates need no regulation, or that airplanes and airplane routes need no supervision? Industry must

be supervised if we consumers are to receive the benefits.

An absolutely stable government is one that is at a stand still; one that does not progress. We do not want that type government, but one that progresses by the stable method such as is the case of the United States Government at the present time. We do not wish to increase the power of the Federal Government by violent revolution, but merely to peacefully give to it the powers it needs to promote technological development, economic security and national unity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

INCREASING THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Aly, Bower.—*Federal Government.* Artcraft Press. 1940-41. Pa. 75c. *Supplement to Federal Power.* Artcraft Press. 1940-41. Pa. 75c.

Academy of Political and Social Science.—*Intergovernmental Relations in the United States.* The Acad. 1940. Pa. $2. *Governmental Expansion in the Economic Sphere.* The Acad. Pa. $2.

Buehler, E. C. (editor).—*Increasing the Power of the Federal Government.* Noble & Noble, Inc., New York. 1940. $2.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.—*Federalism. The Endowment.* 1938. Pa. gratis.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States.—*The American Economic System.* The Chamber, Washington, D.C. *The Sphere of Government.* No. 5 of Series, Outline Talks on Timely Questions Affecting the American Free Enterprise System. The Chamber Washington, D.C.

Greenau, J. T. and Meredith, A. B.—*Everyday Problems of American Democracy.* Houghton. 1940. $1.80.

Lyon, L. S. and Abramson, Victor.—*Government and Economic Life.* Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Magruder, F. A.—*American Government; A Consideration of the Problems of Democracy.* Allyn. 1941. $1.50.

Schlesinger, A. M.—*Political and Social Growth of the American People. 1865-1940.* 3rd. ed. Macmillan. 1941. $3.25.

Sternberg, S. and Lamm, L.—*Our Changing Government.* Lippincott. 1940. $1.80.

Summers, H. B.—*Increasing Federal Power.* Ref. Shelf 14 No. 3. H. W. Wilson, New York. 1940. $1.25. *Planned Economy.* A supplement to Increasing the Federal Power. Ref. Shelf 14 No. 4. H. W. Wilson, New York. 1940.

MAGAZINES AND PERIODICALS

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.—207:1-218, January, 1940. *Intergovernmental Relations in the United States.* W. B. Graves. 206:1-170, November, 1939. *Government Expansion in the Economic Sphere.* A. G. Coons.

Catholic World.—151:226-28, May, 1940. *Government of Laws and Not Government of Men.* E. I. Cobb.

Chinese Social and Political Science Review.—24:15-68, April, 1940. *Organization of Governance; Historical Survey of Functional, Geographic and Social Divisions of Governmental Power.* H. C. E. Zacharias.

Congressional Digest.—19:195-224. August, 1940. *Should the Powers of the Federal Government Be Increased?* Pro and con discussion.

Current History.—52:50, September, 1940. *Primer of Self-government.* P. D. Reed.

Fortune.—21:54-55, March, 1940. *Our Government and Constitution.* Fortune Survey. 21:90-93, February, 1940. *United States Political System: Washington Steals the Show, But 175,000 Local Government Units Are the Guarantee of Democracy.*

Forum.—102:184, October, 1939. *Can Power Be Humanized?* B. Russell.

Nation.—150:79-80, January 20, 1940. *Science of Power.* A. Sturmthal.

New York Times Magazine.—P. 4, December 1, 1940. *When Democracy Must Trim Its Sails.* A. Nevis.

Quarterly Review.—294:325-43, April, 1940. *Nationalism and Federalism.* J. A. R. Marriott.

Scholastic.—37:8-10, October 7, 1940. *Federal Power vs. Decentralization: Who Shall Govern Us, Nation, States, Business?* E. C. McClintock. 37:12, November 25, 1940. *Builders of American Democracy: Hamilton, Madison, the Federalist.* H. A. Tarr. 36:8-9, April 1, 1940. *Balance of Power: American Framework of Government.* J. T. Adams.

School and Society.—50:228-35, August 19, 1939. *Essentials of Democracy.* C. A. Beard.

Social Forces.—18:424-28, March, 1940. *Sources and Limits of Political Power.* L. M. Pape.

Vital Speeches.—7:30-32, October 15, 1940. *Indispensable Principles; Save Them and We Save Our Liberties.* R. Moley. 6:674-49, September 1, 1940. *Fundamentals of Democracy; A Primer of American Self-government.* P. D. Reed. 6:738-42, October 1, 1940. *Your Freedom At Stake.* G. B. Cutten. 6:327-32, March 15, 1940. *Our Republic Is At Stake; Persistent Effort Substitute Dictatorship and Socialism.* R. R. McCormick. 5:729-32, September 15, 1939. *Essentials of Democracy.* C. A. Beard. 5:714-18, September 15, 1939. *Toward A Federal World.* N. M. Butler.

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH TO ALIENS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF HOSTILE NATIONS

ALBION COLLEGE AFFIRMATIVE *vs.* UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN NEGATIVE

In the light of the fifth column activity in the United States, the issues in the debate presented here are particularly pertinent at the present time. What can or what should be done to curb and prevent the activity of foreigners residing in the United States and other representatives of nations which forbid free speech to Americans, and other foreigners, is a serious and interesting matter. Is it practical and possible to make a difference in civil liberties for our own citizens and for the persons residing here who profess allegiance to foreign and hostile powers? This is the subject which the debaters of Albion College and the University of Michigan attempted to solve for an audience of about 150, students, faculty, and townspeople who appeared to hear them May 22, 1941 at Albion, Mich.

The question was stated: *Resolved, that the United States should deny freedom of speech and press to those citizens and/or representatives of nations imposing similar restrictions.*

The debate was presided over by Professor Carroll P. Lahman, Chairman of the Department of Speech at Albion College, and the manuscript was collected and submitted to *Intercollegiate Debates* by Professor Thorrel B. Fest, Director of Debate at Albion College.

The speeches were taken from an electric transcription made while the debate was in progress, and later corrected and edited by the speakers. No essential changes in wording or arguments were made, so the debate appears substantially as given.

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH TO ALIENS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF HOSTILE NATIONS

First Affirmative, Charles Sibert
Albion College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Throughout the history of the world there have been recurring wars, but one struggle has occurred time and time again; that is the conflict between some form of the autocratic philosophy and some form of democratic philosophy. This type of war has proven to be the most bitter of all wars and the one with the most vital effect upon the development of political thought. In times of national emergency the autocratic state has, by its nature of centralized authority, been able to utilize the advantage of swift and comprehensive action in consolidating all its efforts into one major war program. In order to meet the efficiency of such a program, the democratic state has been forced to adopt stringent restrictions upon individuals who might defeat the war effort of the state. For example, America found it necessary to adopt extraordinary measures to insure the efficiency and security of our military preparations during the First World War.

Once again the world is engaged in the old struggle of democracy *versus* dictatorship. President Roosevelt has declared the defeat of the dictator necessary.

The United States has cast her lot with Great Britain for the defense of democracy, and we seem to be on the verge of embarking another expeditionary force. For this reason we feel that the question we are debating today is of the utmost pertinence and importance.

Now the question comes to mind, just what do we mean when we say that freedom of speech and press should be denied to those citizens and representatives of those countries imposing similar restrictions. In the first place, we want to make it absolutely clear that we are in no way abridging the constitutional rights of free speech and press to citizens of the United States. We are not advocating a plan to curtail civil liberties in the United States. Rather, we are advocating a plan which will give our Government some control over citizens or representatives of foreign nations living in this country.

We feel that the definitions of the terms used in this question are self evident. Simply to illustrate them, if there is any citizen of a foreign nation, or any agent, or someone working for the best interests of that nation, and if the nation which they represent, or are a citizen of, does not permit freedom of speech and press to foreigners,—then similar restrictions of freedom of the speech and press will also be denied those persons in the United States.

It is the contention of the Affirmative that this question involves a matter of government policy, rather than any revolutionary change in our social structure. It is a simple, straightforward way to insure a greater degree of unified American effort.

Whether you and I like it or not, we are actively involved in the present world struggle. The Lend-Lease Bill is in operation. Everyone is anxious to hear the President's speech next Wednesday night to learn whether or not under this act America will be convoying ships. The budget has been raised for defense purposes by 28 billions of dollars. Production will stop in July on new models of cars, to permit automobile manufacturers to devote their entire productive energies to defense purposes. Already our program of conscription of men is well under way.

The point is, as Senator Vandenburg said, "Having decided upon this course of action, we must bend every effort to achieve its success." We feel that part of this effort lies in the protection of the American public from subversive elements, from internal dissention,—dissention that slows down the efforts of the nation to achieve its desired ends. Having entered the war, it is the supreme duty of Americans to see that that war is prosecuted with all the resources and strength at our command. And that leads us directly into our next point, and second need, the fact that public opinion, which is so essential for unified support of the American effort, is susceptible to manipulation and distortion by alien minority groups through oral and press propaganda. That public opinion is subject to control is clearly recognized from the last war, during which the United States underwent a complete change in public morale in a little less than six months. It is easily seen in the complete change of public sentiment on the part of the British before and after Munich. In fact, totali-

tarianism is built upon the complete control of public opinion. Totalitarian nations would like nothing better than at the present time to ferment dissatisfaction in the United States and thereby slow down our present war effort.

The Institute for Propaganda Analysis points out that there are some 800 organizations in the United States that could be called pro-Facist. Back in 1937 Japan was spending about 5 million dollars annually for propagandistic purposes. Present figures are not available. The League for Germanism Abroad does not confine its activities to German citizens, but reaches out to all so called "Volksgenossen" or racial comrades. There are potentially large groups in the United States that may be affected by these machinations. There are 14 million aliens, citizens of Germany, Italy, and Russia, living in America, the allegiance of which the totalitarian nations claim. According to Dr. Friederich Lange, editor of a Nazi mouthpiece in Berlin, "We will never call German people who are citizens of foreign countries aliens, but racial comrades. German people will always remain our racial comrades, even if foreign citizenship is forced upon them."

We recognize that these so called "racial comrades" may not be in agreement with these German claims, but the fact remains that they can be reached at the present time by German propaganda and organizations: organizations such as William D. Pelley's Silver Shirts, and George Deatherage's Knights of the White Camellia. We wish that there were time to educate unassimilated aliens to the principle of democracy. That

time is currently not available, and consequently we must protect them from propaganda which, in an emotional crisis, might make them highly susceptible to cultural appeals from the former home land. During the last world war, civil liberties were curtailed to a much greater extent than merely to aliens in this country. We feel that we must take some kind of a lesson from the last war, and certainly that lesson indicates that some kind of action is necessary now.

Totalitarian nations prevent their people from becoming exposed to propaganda from democratic nations. England has realized the necessity of curtailing Fascistic propaganda. In a recent conversation I had with Mrs. Arthur Turner, an American citizen who, until last September, was conducting an air raid shelter in Yorkshire, England; she made the statement that in England freedom of speech and press had been denied to those people spreading subversive propaganda.

You have undoubtedly all read of the intensive efforts of the United States to combat fifth column activity in the Latin American nations during the last few years. Definite steps have been taken by our Government to control subversive elements. The State Department requires the registration of all agents of foreign nations. The registration of all aliens is now required. Important areas and factories have been closed to the public, the Soo locks in upper Michigan being only one example. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has greatly increased its staff with enlarged appropriations. Attorney-General Jackson has asked for new power to hold aliens. Have we learned any-

thing from the last war? Since at the present time we are actively engaged in the war, since public opinion is subject to distortion and manipulation, since there are potentially large groups in the United States that may be affected by subversive influence, and since the United States is already attempting to control to some extent subversive influences in the country, surely the need is clearly established that aliens and agents of foreign nations should be denied the freedom of speech and press.

Now this is not a new or unusual practice. It allows all who are citizens in good faith the privileges of free speech. It in no sense represents a denial of constitutional rights. It simply means that those people who profess allegiance to work for, or are in any way related to, totalitarian governments, "must accept the same treatment their governments accord others." This is in reality a matter concerned with foreign policy. We restrict Japanese immigration because such immigration is undesirable inasmuch as it weakens our labor market. We restrict trade in essential commodities to insure the efficiency of our production.

Summarizing, what we of the Affirmative plan to do is to cut the propaganda flow at its most vital source—the appeal that reaches the individual by personal contact. And because we have shown you the need for such action today; because we have shown you that such action would be highly practicable and would not curtail our civil liberties, we urge you to adopt the Affirmative proposition, and deny freedom of speech

and press to those citizens and representatives of nations imposing similar restrictions.

First Negative, Arthur Biggins
University of Michigan

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: These are grave times. No one appreciates this fact more than Mr. Muehl and I do. But we must keep in mind the fact that it is not our first crisis. We have faced these problems before. The issue is not whether aliens are at work here propagating their alien faith, nor is the issue whether or not we should censor speech and press in this country. We have no absolute freedom to speak or to write now. The question is whether or not our present public policy is adequate.

Yes, we have a definite public policy today in respect to freedom of speech and press. Mr. Sibert apparently has forgotten this for he has made no mention of our present policy. This policy has developed from a long experience—through several wars, civil conflicts and strained social conditions. Yet, through all this time, never once has a man's freedom to speak or write depended upon the country of his origin, the criterion the Affirmative would have us adopt. No, we have not asked a man his nationality, his race or his creed. We have not asked him his religion, his political party or his economic class. Only one thing we have asked. Does what he has to say constitute a clear and a present danger to the republic? That is our public policy today.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, if this is a crisis, if we are concerned with the war effort, as Mr. Sibert seems to be, what better public policy can we have than this? Does the matter, does what a man has to say, constitute a clear and present danger to the republic? Mr. Muehl and I see no need to change this policy. For instance, Mr. Sibert said this, "The censorship efforts of the World War were complete. Perhaps too complete." This I should like to point out: the enabling clause of the National Defense Act of 1916 is still in effect. If they see the World War censorship as adequate, they need do nothing today. We have the same policy. If anything constitutes a clear and a present danger, our executive officers have absolute power to suppress it, subject only to the review of the courts.

The criterion the Affirmative would set up is this. From what country does the man come and does that country prohibit freedom of speech and press? This criterion is discriminatory, unnecessary, and involves many added difficulties. In the first place, just because a man happens to be a German, does that mean he can teach us nothing? The gentlemen would have us believe that this is the case. If we took the gentlemen at their word, it would mean a policy similar to that in Germany today. Hitler will not allow publications of the American Medical Journal in Germany. The publishers are Jews. He won't allow the teaching of the theory of relativity—Einstein is a Jew. They won't teach Freudian psychology—Freud was a Jew. Because a man happens to be of the Jewish race, National Socialism assumes he can teach Aryans nothing.

Mr. Sibert vigorously denounces Hitler. Germany's policies, he says, must be crushed. Yet what would he have us do in this country? Adopt the same discriminatory policies, but on a different basis. If a man happens to come from Germany where freedom of speech and press is denied, he would deny to him freedom of speech and press in this country. What does this mean? Some of our greatest doctors, our greatest scientists, are German. Some of our greatest musicians and artists are German. Yet because these men are citizens of a country where freedom of speech and press is denied, the Affirmative would deny these same liberties to them in this country. It seems fairly obvious that we can learn much from these men in these fields, but can we conclude, as the gentlemen would have us conclude, that they can teach us absolutely nothing in the field of the social sciences. That is the conclusion toward which they are driving us.

I would ask this further question. What are those countries where these "life-liberties" are denied? Mr. Sibert said, "In England freedom of speech and press has been denied to those people spreading subversive propaganda." By their own words it is not only Germany, not only Italy, not only Russia that suppresses subversive elements, but also England. Therefore, pressing the proposition to its conclusion, Lord Halifax, and all English citizens and representatives are to be denied freedom of speech and press in this country today. Yet it is the Affirmative themselves who say we must bend every effort in England's behalf.

An absurd situation, but not quite as absurd as this.

Let us assume that there is a cause for action. Let us further assume we can tell which countries deny freedom of speech and press according to our present prejudice. Now how about these dictatorial doctrines? It obviously means Goebbels can't speak, doesn't it? It means Rosenberg can't spread his race hatred. But what does it mean further? Thomas Mann is a German citizen. Edward Benes comes from a country which denies these liberties today. Yet I challenge the gentlemen to present any two men who have spread the democratic philosophy more faithfully than they. By the Affirmative's proposition, these men are to be denied freedom of speech and press in this country. These are two clear cut cases, but how about a couple like this? You have all read *The Revolt of Nihilism* by Rauschnigg; you've read *Out of the Night* by Jan Valtin. They, too, are citizens of one of these countries. But wait a minute—they don't believe in democracy. They are merely a Nazi and a Communist condemning Hitler. And a more eloquent denunciation of Hitler's regime you cannot find.

Take another case. Many of the South American countries are Fascistic. Their representatives in this country believe in dictatorial principles. Yet these are the states that are uniting with us to form a western hemispheric block against Axis aggression. Further, what becomes of our good-neighbor policy, our spirit of Pan-Americanism? Apply Mr. Sibert's two premises. These men are citizens of foreign nations. These nations do not permit any freedom of speech or press. Therefore, his conclusion?—I quote him,

"Freedom of speech and press will also be denied to these persons in the United States."

If the Affirmative means to bend every war effort in democracy's cause, how can they do it by denying to these men freedom of speech and press? That, to use Mr. Sibert's phrase, is not "bending our efforts," it is warping them.

We now can show by comparison that our present public policy is effective. We can show that the nationality basis is totally inadequate. When will we restrain Goebbels or Simitroff, the Nazi and Communist propaganda directors, from speaking or writing in this country? When what they have to say constitutes "a clear and a present danger to the republic." When will we suppress Rauschnigg or Valtin? Again, foreigners, but against Hitler. When will we suppress Kuhn or Browder, our own citizens? When what they have to say constitutes an immediate danger to our country. But at no time does a man's right to speak depend upon the country from which he comes. Nor on his religion, creed, or economic class. *Danger,* not discrimination, is the basis of our present public policy.

But let us put all these arguments aside for the time being. Let us assume that there is a cause for action. Let us further assume for argument's sake that we can tell whether a man should speak or not by the country from which he comes. Let us assume for the moment that there is an alien program in the United States and that these aliens must be suppressed.

By the gentlemen's own statistics there are fourteen million aliens in the United States today. That means

one in every ten persons is going to be denied the freedom of speech and press in this country. Mr. Sibert further pointed out we already require the registration of foreign agents in this country. He pointed out all aliens must register under a more recent act. I propose these further questions. If he is an enemy agent, if he is an alien spy, can we not handle him under the Alien Espionage Act. If the case is not severe enough to come under this law, we still can deport all undesirable aliens on whatever grounds. The Affirmative themselves can petition the Department of Labor to deport them. What more do they want? If an alien constitutes a danger to this country, we can handle him under one of several acts. And at the same time we certainly avoid the absurdities of the proposition the gentlemen are advocating this evening.

This is a crisis. But it is not the first crisis. Our Government has faced these problems before. Our Government, as we know, has sustained freedom well, and is still maintaining the free institutions we enjoy today. Mr. Muehl and I stand firmly for our present public policy. We see absolutely no need for changing it.

Second Affirmative, Tom Brock
Albion College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Thus far in the debate it seems that the Affirmative and the Negative are in agreement that the United States is in an extremely critical situation, that it is facing an emergency period,

and that it has now embarked upon a course known as non-belligerency and also non-neutrality. That the United States has actually entered this war on the side of Great Britain is well known to all. However, the Negative argues that in our search for adequate defense we must not warp our idea of constitutional liberties. Mr. Sibert and I agree in this warning; we do not wish to warp our idealism, and we wish to be fair in our advocacy of the proposition. In being fair one can easily see that this proposal is aimed not at the liberties of true American citizens, but is aimed rather at the liberties of men such as Pelley of the Silver Shirts, Browder of the Communist Party, and Kuhn of the German-American Bund. Those are the men who will be faced with the loss of freedom to speak and to write.

The Negative explains that historically there has been but one criterion for judging the wisdom of censorship and that is, "Does the individual's action constitute a clear and present danger to the republic?" Therefore, Mr. Biggins concluded there is no need for such censorship, however, neglecting the intermediary step of showing that a real and present danger actually does not exist. In his argument the Negative speaker ignored the specific causes for alarm which Mr. Sibert presented in the first Affirmative speech. By their silence, we believe the Negative has admitted the existence of propaganda which warps public opinion and the perpetration of acts which destroy the loyalty of a citizen to his Government. Those are the dangers to our national defense which we are attempting to remove under our proposal. Thus, we contend that the crite-

rion suggested by the Negative, that of a clear and present danger, when applied to the current situation, demonstrates a need for the proposition.

Mr. Biggins contended further that the law of 1916 can take care of the situation, and thus there is no need for the proposed denial of freedom of speech and press to citizens or representatives of countries having similar restrictions. May I ask the Negative what in the world they believe this act of 1916 is if it is not our proposition carried to its logical conclusion and put into effect immediately? If the act of 1916 is enforced today, the proposition is adopted, for both approaches concern themselves with the denial of freedom of speech and press. If our opponents concede the law of 1916 to be just and workable, we fail to understand their objections to the question we are debating.

Since this proposition is a rather peculiar one and is not adapted to a discussion of technicalities in a proposed plan, we believe that the best manner of discussing its value is that of considering the objections raised by the gentlemen from Michigan. The important issue today is concerned with contrary principles: the principle of unlimited liberties against the one of legislatively restricted liberties. One of the essential points in this difference is whether we are in an emergency period great enough to warrant stringent restrictions on certain privileges. Mr. Biggins obviously answered for the Negative when he said, "We are facing one of the greatest crises of all our history." Consequently, our opponents are agreeing with our contention that America is facing an emergency and that

drastic action is in order. Our premise in the debate, a premise not mentioned by the opposition, was that when a democratic nation enters upon a struggle with an autocratic state it must adopt stringent measures in order successfully to meet the totalitarian challenge.

The Negative asked us: Just because a man is a German, why do you wish to prevent him from speaking. We have German artists, German chemists, and German authors who can impart much learning to the American mind. The example of Benes was given, who the Negative claim is now a German and would lose his freedom here. Now, Benes is Czechoslovakian, and just because his country has been absorbed by Germany does not deprive him of the Czech citizenship. The United States has not recognized the conquest of that state and, furthermore, the Czech minister in Washington still maintains his embassy. Ask Benes, who is a political exile, whether he accepts German citizenship. These men, citizens of conquered territory, are not Germans in any sense of the word. They are not Germans by birth or by affiliation. Thus, one phase of the Negative argument is not logical.

Further, the Negative asked what was going to happen to men such as Rauschnigg and Valtin, who they claim are greatly aiding the United States in the war upon alien influences. Our answer to this situation lies in the question, "Where is the supreme loyalty of these men? Is it in Germany or in the United States? Does the man admit to divided loyalty to two countries or does he announce single loyalty to the United States?" If the answer is that he has a loyalty to both Germany

and America or that he has a supreme loyalty to Germany, the only logical step to take in this crisis is to remove the means by which he can become a subversive influence. Take away his freedom of speech and press if he refuses to renounce his loyalty to an enemy nation. If, on the other hand, the answer to the question is that the supreme loyalty is to the United States, we say that the logical step is for him to become a citizen of the United States and thus protect his right to speak and to write. We are now at the crux of the Affirmative case. Our proposal is not designed to deny the liberties of any citizens who demonstrate supreme loyalty to the government of our country. We are attempting only to destroy the freedom to act and to speak of those persons who have a loyalty to an enemy country which is above the loyalty to America. In this manner we are insuring the successful operation of our defense program, for alien influences would have no means of distorting national opinion and unanimity by use of propaganda.

The Negative has explained that if we include Germany, Russia and Italy in our list of nations having restrictions upon American citizens, we must also include England. Here is their reasoning. England has adopted measures to curtail the liberties of representatives of the Fascistic powers and do not permit the existence of German or Italian propaganda. A few seconds later Mr. Biggins concluded that the United States would, under the proposition, be required to deny the right to speak of Viscount Halifax and of other English representatives. Now where is the logic

in this conclusion? Just because England refuses to allow propaganda by nations with whom she is at war does not require reprisal by the United States, for our plan calls only for action against those whose fatherlands impose restrictions upon American citizens.

The objections by the opposition have also included the argument that under the Espionage and Undesirable Alian Acts the United States can take action against any persons in this country. Therefore, it is alleged that the proposal is unnecessary since we can today deport undesirable aliens and we can restrict the activities of saboteurs and spies. The question was asked, "Exactly what more does the Affirmative wish?" Our position in regard to this argument is that even with the existence of previous laws we have the widespread evils of foreign propaganda as shown by Mr. Sibert. And as we have already pointed out, this is a question of policy—are we to enforce these laws. Furthermore, there has been invoked no law which would curtail the liberty of undesirables to continue their use of subversive propaganda. Let us take a concrete example. Harry Bridges has been shown to be affiliated with Communistic propaganda. He is a citizen of Russia while still a resident of the United States, and his deportation has been demanded for several years. Yet, he is still in this country and, although detained by federal authorities, he remains connected with foreign elements who wish to destroy the American Government.

The Espionage Act and the Undesirable Alien Deportation Act are in effect, but they are limited in their

capacity. First, these acts do not stop the continuance of subversive activities in the form of speech and press by subordinates of those deported. Second, it is extremely difficult to prove guilt of actual espionage or sabotage, in spite of the obvious attempts by aliens to undermine our present defense effort. The thousands of men and women who are threatening our internal security cannot be silenced under present laws.

We conclude that the only effective means of eliminating the threat of weakened national unity is to deny the freedom of speech and press to those persons whose supreme loyalty is not to American democracy but is rather to some foreign ideology.

Second Negative, E. Wm. Muehl
University of Michigan

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I don't like to quibble about isolated facts, but one point has been made here this evening which is typical of the confusion, if not the hysteria, that is sweeping over the class of persons represented by those who urge the adoption of this proposition. Mr. Brock stated that Harry Bridges, being a citizen of Russia, would, under the terms of the proposition, be denied freedom of speech. Mr. Bridges is a citizen of Australia! He would not be denied freedom of speech were this proposal adopted; and so this great network of propaganda that is being woven at the present time would not be touched. But we can silence Harry Bridges if he is dangerous. Do you know how? Not by looking into his racial background

to see what his blood is or what his birth certificate says, but by waiting until Mr. Bridges says something which in the estimation of our highest tribunal constitutes a clear and present danger to the security of the republic. Then we don't care whether he's a German, an Australian, a Russian, or a Pole. If he is dangerous, he will be silenced regardless of his race or national background.

Now that is the position that the Negative team takes here this evening. We don't care where a man comes from. We don't care what accent he uses. It's the words that come from his mouth; it's the danger involved in what he says that interests us!

There's another interesting question of fact brought up by the gentlemen of the Affirmative that ought to be at least questioned here this evening. That fact is this—that everyone who expresses sympathy with some foreign country is by nature of that expression a representative of that country. Now in other words Mr. Kuhn, a bona fide, American citizen, Mr. Browder, whose ancestors came over on the Mayflower, and a lot of these other men such as Mr. Pelley, who are citizens, because they express a point of view contrary to that held by the majority of the people, are automatically representatives of some foreign power. Now isn't that absurd on the face of it! An American citizen has the right to express sympathy with any country, with any ideology; and Mr. Brock is very much concerned, you'll remember, that we're not going to curtail the civil liberties of American citizens. You remember, he said that. An American citizen has the right to express

sympathy with any nation, provided what he says does not constitute a "clear and present danger" to the security of the republic and I refer you to the words of Mr. Justice Holmes in the case of *Schenk vs. The United States.*

The Negative team takes its stand this evening right alongside the Supreme Court as it enunciated its doctrine in that case.

Now, when we come to a consideration of who constitutes a representative of a foreign government, we don't have to handle the matter out of thin air, out of our imaginations. The Congress of the United States undertook to pass in 1938 a statute in which it declared who should be considered a "representative of a foreign power." That statute, House Bill 1591, set up a class of persons who should be so considered; and in that class neither Mr. Pelley, Mr. Browder, nor Mr. Kuhn would be included because the criterion is that the individual must be admittedly receiving salary or pay from some foreign power. So Mr. Pelley and the others mentioned would not be by that law and cannot be under the terms of the proposition considered in the group whose rights are to be restricted. These men are American citizens whose freedom of speech would not be curtailed by the gentlemen of the Affirmative.

We have seen what the Affirmative proposal could not accomplish. Let us, therefore, turn our attention to what would result from its adoption.

In the first place, as Mr. Biggins pointed out, freedom of speech would be taken from men like Thomas Mann, Jan Valtin, and Herman Rauschnigg, refugees

who have fled from tyranny for the right to speak out against tyranny. And we're going to take it from them. After they have endured Heaven only knows what hardships for the right to tell the world what hellish things are going on over there, they are not going to be permitted to speak. Mr. Brock has told us in his best senatorial manner that if these men love this country and want to enjoy its liberties, they should become citizens. Now very frankly it takes seven years to become a citizen of the United States. Must they be quiet during that period? In addition, would you respect Thomas Mann more if he kept his German citizenship and went throughout the world working and fighting for the type of Germany which he believes should exist, or if he deserted that suffering nation and crawled into the protecting shelter of American citizenship. I don't know how Mr. Brock feels, but I respect Mr. Mann more for the position he holds at the present time.

To summarize our objections to the Affirmative case:

First, their proposition would prevent men who have fled from tyranny from speaking against it, because the very fact that they did speak against Nazism would not exclude them from the category set up in the statement "citizens and/or representatives of countries where like liberties are denied." Let's not forget that.

The second disadvantage that would result from the adoption of the Affirmative proposal is that some several thousand American citizens would be deprived of freedom of speech. Now why do I say that? Because under the same act referred to earlier, House Bill 1591,

entitled "A Bill to Require the Registration of Certain Persons Employed by Foreign Agencies for the Purpose of Disseminating Propaganda," under this act are included persons who although citizens of America, are in the pay of a foreign government or a public corporation under such a government. Thus, a large number of American citizens employed by European travel agencies and paid by these agencies would be deprived of freedom of speech and press. But among these we would not find Mr. Pelley, Mr. Browder, or Mr. Kuhn; because it has not been proven and can't be proven that they are receiving remuneration from a foreign government.

The third result of this proposition would be that should Mr. Browder or Mr. Kuhn when they get out of jail; and it might be well to note that these men are in jail which would seem to indicate that we can handle them pretty well at the present time, should Mr. Kuhn, when he get out of jail, go to England to make a speech, the British government would have to let this American citizen speak his Fascistic mouthings or else we in this country would have to silence Mr. Halifax. You see Mr. Kuhn is an American citizen and were he forbidden to speak in England, then England would be guilty of denying freedom of speech and this would compel us to silence her citizens in this country.

The fourth result of such a policy would be to lend credence to what Adolf Hitler has been telling the German people for years. "The world is against Germany." Just what Mussolini has been telling the Italian people, "The world is against Italy." In other

words, "in America they let everyone but a German or an Italian say what he wants to. They let all sorts of people speak out against their government and its political philosophy but they deny all right of political speaking to Germans and Italians." Yes, this would prove to many of the misled people of Europe that even the land of the free had turned against them in a time when many of them look to this country as a free man's last hope.

These, then, are the four disadvantages which would result from the adoption of the Affirmative plan. It would prevent Thomas Mann from speaking. It would deprive thousands of Americans of their freedom of speech. It would force the British to let any American Fascist speak. And it would prove to the world the truth of Hitler's most frequent accusation, i.e., that the world is against Germany and discriminates against Germans.

But let us ask what would this bill accomplish? Absolutely nothing! Mr. Pelley would go on talking. Mr. Browder would go on talking. Mr. Kuhn would go on talking. For they are citizens of the United States and not representatives of a foreign power.

I think that we can sum up the Negative position very well by reminding you of something which Mr. Sibert said in his opening speech. We are joining with Britain to defend democracy. He didn't say to defeat Hitler. He said to defend democracy. Then I say, and the Negative says this evening, that the place to begin defending democracy is at home; to keep this country a place where the oppressed and downtrodden

of the whole world may come and cry out against the thing that has crushed them. If we concentrate on doing this, we can let Goebbels, Rosenberg, or any other Nazi spell-binder come to this country and try to convert our people. I am positive that they won't make a single convert. You can't destroy true love of freedom with mere words. So we earnestly urge the rejection of the Affirmative proposal.

First Negative Rebuttal, Arthur Biggins
University of Michigan

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Unlimited liberties against legislatively restricted liberties, that is the issue Mr. Brock advanced. He still forgets that we possess no unlimited liberty to speak in this country today. Let Mr. Brock cry "fire" falsely in a crowded theatre. He'll find out what I mean. The issue is what policy should we follow in our restriction of these liberties.

The policy the gentlemen first presented was one which would, in their own words, "in no way abridges the constitutional rights of free speech and press to U.S. citizens." They insisted they would not curtail civil liberties in the United States. Yet the specific men they would restrain were Messrs. Pelley, Browder, and Kuhn. All citizens under our government, with full constitutional rights to speak and write—just as long as what they have to say does not constitute a clear and present danger to the republic. We pressed them on this point. We pointed out that their plan wouldn't touch these men.

It was then we beheld their remarkable transition. Oh, they must be citizens in good faith, they said. It is only true American citizens who will not be affected. Why? Mr. Sibert asks the question and then answers it. "Our effort must lie in the protection of the American public from subversive elements."

"On this occasion it may be stressed again that the state cannot allow its institutions which solely serve the people, to be abused by corroding and destructive and malicious criticism by a small and impudent clique." This quotation describes the Affirmative stand well, doesn't it? Or take this, "We cannot tolerate a press, the exclusive purpose of which is to destroy what we have undertaken to build." That is clearly the position the gentlemen of the Affirmative are taking this evening. Yet these are not their words. They are the words of Adolf Hitler at a Nuremberg rally.

Yes, the very man they have despised so much, is the man who summarizes their case so well. For in Germany, too, only true German citizens are allowed to speak and write.

The gentlemen of the Affirmative would not only have us imitate them. They would even have German or Russian or Italian policy determine our own. All a country of "an alien ideology" would have to do to restrict civil liberties in this country would be to restrict it in their own country. We, with the parrot policy the Affirmative advocates, would immediately follow suit.

We of the Negative deny a man should be deprived of freedom of speech and press because he is a German.

Thomas Mann is more German than Adolf Hitler himself. We deny a man should be denied freedom to speak just because he is a Fascist. It would silence men like Rauschnigg and Valtin. It would restrict the civil liberties of many of our own citizens. Our Good Neighbor policy would be disrupted. And a man's music, art, or medicine still might be good in spite of his politics.

This government remains a government which can tolerate criticism. Mr. Muehl and I firmly believe that. We believe in democracy because it can tolerate a criticism that would crumble any Fascist state.

To suppress opposition is the simplest policy. That is what the dictatorships do. To have a government responsible to its people on a level which can tolerate criticism and survive is more difficult. Yet that government needs no Gestapo to keep it in power.

Mr. Muehl and I take the more difficult alternative. We believe the people, given free access to the facts, yes, even to the soul-seering propaganda the opposition worry about, and given free vent to discuss it, will remain faithful to our present ideals.

We would not restrict a man in speaking just because he is a German or a Jew, a Protestant or a Catholic, rich or poor. Such criteria are ineffective as well as discriminatory. We say let a man be restricted when what he has to say presents such an immediate danger that it may overcome us before there is time to discuss it fully. We recognize that action of whatever variety is necessary then. But let it remain clear that it is the imminence of danger, and not the person-

ality of the speaker that causes the restriction. That if there were full time for discussion he might say what he will.

When a government can't tolerate a free criticism of its institutions, we don't believe we should tolerate that government. That is the logic which persuades us that the proposition of the Affirmative should not be adopted.

Second Negative Rebuttal, E. Wm. Muehl
University of Michigan

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Before going any further in this discussion there is one thing that should be definitely made clear. That is the proper interpretation of the question. The Affirmative team is urging us this evening to adopt a policy of denying freedom of speech and press to the citizens and the representatives of those countries where like liberties are denied. Two groups are to be included in the category of those to whom these liberties would be forbidden. Let us look at these two groups and see just how inclusive they are. First, the term citizens. This class of individuals is easily defined. It embraces all those who in the eyes of international law owe their primary legal allegiance to a particular country. The question as stated proposes the denial of certain rights to "the citizens" of certain countries. It doesn't say some citizens nor does it apply only to most citizens. It says "the citizens" and if I am not confusing my grammatical rules that term "the" is completely inclusive, it in-

cludes all citizens. It seems obvious to the Negative that the terms of the proposition would necessarily result in the silencing of Mann and Rauschnigg. They are citizens of countries where those specified liberties are denied.

But in attempting to prove that they ought to be allowed to exempt from their law certain individuals because they say things that we like to hear, the gentlemen have admitted what we have insisted all evening, namely that the criterion should be not where they come from, but what they say. Have they admitted this? Surely! Their reasoning has been as follows: We like what Thomas Mann says and so will let him speak. Thus, they have accepted as their criterion the nature of the man's speeches not the country to which he owes legal allegiance. But the Negative still holds to its original interpretation of the question and insists that it must include all citizens of the offending nations.

Then let us look at the second category. This consists of the "representatives of those nations where like liberties are denied." The gentlemen have tried to include under this head all those who express opinions which they do not like. They would have us believe that all those individuals who have any faith in the ideals of Russia or Germany are automatically representatives of those nations. We may not agree with such persons, but to call them representatives of some European Power is absurd. They may in all honesty believe that this country should adopt a socialist form of government.

Just because we realized the absurdity of trying to

define the word "representative" in such an ambiguous way, we have used the definition set forth in the statutes of the United States which define a representative as one who receives a stipend from some foreign power; and we feel that such an interpretation of the term is fair and reasonable for the purposes of this debate. Obviously we cannot let the Affirmative include in the term anyone whose views are distasteful to some group in the United States.

Thus we see that under a reasonable interpretation of terms, an interpretation set forth by the Congress of the United States which has not been changed in any way since its adoption, neither Browder, nor Pelley, nor Kuhn would be classified as representatives of a foreign power. Indeed, one of those gentlemen, Mr. Pelley, is very nationalistic and has no use for any country but this one. But, although these men would be free to speak, Lord Halifax would not be so; because, as Mr. Sibert said himself in his opening speech, the British have denied free press to several groups of persons. Thus, as the representative of Britain Mr. Halifax would come under the heading of those to whom the specified liberties would be denied.

The contradictions within the Affirmative case are even more obvious when we consider the contention that Mr. Pelley of the Silver Shirts is inciting aliens to rebellion against the United States. Anyone who has read Mr. Pelley's books or speeches can testify that he hates the alien. He'd like to send them all back where they came from. He would *like* to see them denied

freedom of speech and press. Mr. Pelley is arousing the alien against no one but Mr. Pelley.

Finally, let us ask this: How many of you here this evening can name several eloquent Nazi orators who are effectively stumping this country on behalf of the Hitler regime? How many have read telling articles against democracy printed in their local newspaper? Very, very few, I'm sure. The saboteurs are among us, but they are working secretly and no law suppressing free speech is going to hamper them. In fact, they are more likely to be found supporting such laws.

Thus, because it is based upon a false analysis; because it would limit vital liberties and the basis of personalities and races rather than actual danger; because it would prevent men like Thomas Mann from speaking while forcing Britain to let American Fascists and Communists speak; because it would be the type of nationalistic discrimination which has made Hitler infamous, we sincerely urge the rejection of the Affirmative proposition.

First Affirmative Rebuttal, Charles Sibert
Albion College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It has been very interesting tonight for the Affirmative to analyze the position of Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl in this debate. And after the last two speeches (just presented by Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl) and before the debate goes any further, I want to make clear in your minds just

what the Affirmative is trying to bring about by the adoption of this policy.

Ask yourself this question. As a matter of policy, would it be a wise thing for our Government to allow citizens or representatives of foreign nations the freedom of speech and press, when the nations they represent have political ideals which are the direct antithesis of the ideals of democracy? Would it not be a poor policy for the United States to allow these people the freedom of speech when the propaganda they spread would cause internal dissension in our country when, as both Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl have admitted, the United States is in a period of crisis?

As I pointed out to you in my constructive speech, and as Mr. Brock established, we are advocating the denial of freedom of speech and press to citizens and representatives of foreign countries imposing similar restrictions only as a matter of governmental policy, a policy which will place us on a more equal footing with those Fascistic nations in this period of crisis. This policy will enable the Government to cut at its source much of the pro-Fascistic propaganda which is spreading throughout the country, and which Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl have admitted exists, through such sources as the German Library of Information, The League for Germanism Abroad, the Volksbund, and similar agencies. We advocate this question, moreover, as a policy which will bring about greater American unity.

Now in light of this, let us analyze the main objections that Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl have raised to our proposition to secure this greater American unity.

One of their strongest objections has been the fact that by denying freedom of speech and press to aliens, we would be keeping such men as Mann, Benes, and other great scientists, cultural leaders, in general—all refugees from totalitarianism, from speaking in this country when they had messages for democracy which United States citizens should hear.

Ladies and Gentlemen, remembering that we are considering this question as a matter of governmental policy, since when can it be said that it would be against that policy to let men who wished to further the cause of democracy speak, whether they may be Germans, Italians, or Russians?

It is the opinion of the Affirmative that Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl are trying to hold us to a very limited and strict interpretation of the terms of the question. The Affirmative are trying to fashion a tool which will allow our Government to cut as much pro-Fascistic propaganda as is possible at its source. In so doing we are denying the freedom of speech and press to certain classes of people. Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl had interpreted this to mean that all members of those classes, no matter what their political views, will not be allowed to speak. Rather it means that all members of those classes shall not have the right to speak whenever and wherever they so desire, nor have they the right to print whatever they so desire. Denying freedom of speech and press means strict censorship for those classes involved, but cannot be interpreted to mean that if they have a message to further the cause of democracy, and not in opposition to government

policy, they will not be allowed to speak. We feel that this makes clear another of Mr. Muehl's objections to our plan, that of our proposition forcing England to let such men as Browder and Kuhn speak there or denying Lord Halifax this privilege in America.

Perhaps the only other valid objection that Mr. Biggins and Mr. Muehl have to the Affirmative's proposition is that we are going to prohibit freedom of speech and press to certain citizens of our country, while not being able to keep men such as Browder, Kuhn, and Pelley from speaking. By this, Mr. Muehl referred to these persons conducting so-called travel agencies in the United States and receiving their pay from totali-

men were spreading their propaganda. Ladies and Gentlemen, we of the Affirmative feel that if a man is organizing Fascistic organizations and working for the cause of Fascism, as a matter of policy he should be denied the freedom of speech and press and be classified as an agent of a foreign nation.

In concluding, because we have shown you we are not denying freedom of speech and press to *bona fide* citizens, because the Negative have agreed that there is a subversive propaganda being spread in the Uinted States today, we urge you that, as a matter of governmental policy to promote the ends of our present defensive efforts, a system of denial of free speech and press to citizens and representatives of nations imposing similar restrictions be adopted.

Second Affirmative Rebuttal, Tom Brock
Albion College

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If we discuss the problem of Browder, Kuhn, and the other men that the Negative are so concerned about, we learn that the reasoning is this: these men, admittedly undesirable, are citizens of the United States, and if freedom of speech is denied them, the rights of American citizens are encroached upon. That, according to the opposition, is a violation of American constitutional liberties, and it fosters the very thing Hitler wishes to foster, namely, Fascism. But earlier in the debate you will recall that our friends from Ann Arbor in effect said this: There is no need for such a proposition, for we

can handle undesirables such as Kuhn and Browder under our existing laws. We can throw them into jail. And they proceeded to show how these two men are languishing in jail at the present time.

Thus, the actual point of conflict is not so great. The Affirmative maintain that because these men are harmful to our democracy they should be denied the privileges of use of the press and speech by law. The Negative recognizes the danger and advocates imprisonment. But Mr. Sibert and I are alleged to be the proponents of an undemocratic plan. We really fail to see the difference between a legal denial of certain rights and imprisonment where it is physically impossible for the men to exercise those rights. The techniques of the two teams are the same.

Mr. Muehl and Mr. Biggens have confronted us with the problem of men like Browder going to England where they will certainly be denied the privileges of speaking. They then concluded that the United States will be forced to deny similar privileges to Viscount Halifax. Mr. Sibert and I consider this an extremely unlikely situation brought in as a confusing technicality by the Negative. Let it suffice to say that all emigrants require permission from our State Department and all immigrants into England require special action by the British Government. How will Browder and his cohorts ever get into England? It appears that the opposition prefers not to discuss the main issue which is "Shall the United States in the present crisis deny certain liberties to men who have a supreme loyalty to an enemy nation?"

In this debate four classes of people have been discussed in relation to a denial of free press and speech. The first class is that of men like Browder, Pelley and Kuhn. The Negative has supported the idea that these men are being handled now. We are glad to accept this argument for it removes one group of men we would ordinarily have to deal with and the argument in no way destroys the wisdom of this specific proposal. The Negative position seems to say, "Because you're not getting all the undesirables, you shouldn't get any of them."

The second class of people discussed by the opposition includes men such as Mann and Valtin. The Negative have argued that these men are citizens of foreign countries which are enemies of the United States, and that these men would be silenced under the proposition. My colleague and I replied that these men can become citizens of our country if they are not loyal citizens of Germany, Italy, or Russia. But the answer came back that it takes seven years to become a naturalized citizen. Yet we contend that it takes only a few months for one to renounce his foreign citizenship and to apply for his first papers in naturalization. After the renunciation of other citizenship, and the application for American papers, Mann or Valtin would not be citizens of an alien nation.

The third class introduced into the discussion includes the several thousand workers for German and Italian travel agencies in this country. Since these people are paid by those enemy governments, our friends would have us believe that these persons are

000,000 aliens in this country, the Negative has chosen only one or two thousand persons and has objected to the proposition. We believe that this is another technicality and that our opponents are endeavoring to evade the basic principle underlying this question.

The last group includes those persons who are genuine Nazi and Fascist propagandists, and those are the people we wish to silence. The Negative at no time in this debate denied that these evil influences are present. They did, on the other hand, admit that these persons are spreading subversive propaganda, and Mr. Biggins at one time said that these are extremely critical times. If that is so, men such as Fritz Wiedermann, the Nazi consul at San Francisco, who directs a network of propaganda agencies on the west coast, should be denied the privileges of speaking and writing freely. Men like this are the ones we wish to silence.

At the beginning of this debate Mr. Biggins argued that we must have a real and present danger before we can limit those liberties of press and speech. Then, the Negative contended, if that danger is present, we should put into effect the 1916 law which denies those liberties to all citizens. There is that real and present danger, as we have established and the Negative has not denied; thus, according to the opposition's logic, limitations are in order. We propose the denial of freedom to citizens or representatives of enemy countries, those who give supreme loyalty to another nation. The Negative does not apparently object to our principle, despite their carefully voiced concerns over constitutional freedom, for they advocate a law which denies liberty to all. We do not go that far, but maintain that

since the Negative has accepted the principle behind the question, that the proposal should be adopted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

DENIAL OF FREE SPEECH AND PRESS TO NATIONALS OF COUNTRIES ENFORCING SIMILAR REGULATIONS

Books and Pamphlets

Britt, George.—*The Fifth Column Is Here.* 124 p. Funk. Pa. $1.

Childs, H. L.—*Propaganda and Dictatorship.* Princeton University Press. 1936.

Creel, George.—*How We Advertised America.*

Dies, Martin.—*The Trojan Horse in America.* 366 p. Dodd, Mead, New York. 1940.

Donovan, W. J. and Mowrer, E. A.—*Fifth Column Lessons for America.* American Council on Public Affairs. Pa. 25c.

Faust, Albert.—*The German Element in the United States.*

Foreign Affairs.—*German Reich and Americans of German Origin.* Pamphlet No. 43. Oxford University Press, New York. 1938.

Kamp, J. P.—*Fifth Column vs. Dies Committee.* Constitutional Education League, 831 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn. Pa. 25c. *Fifth Column in Washington.* Constitutional Education League.

Langdon-Davies, J.—*Fifth Column.* Musson. Pa. 25c.

Laswell, H. D.—*Propaganda Techniques in the World War.* Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 1927. *World Revolutionary Propaganda.* 393 p. Alfred A. Knopf. 1939.

Lavine, Harold.—*Fifth Column in America.* Doubleday. $2.50.

Lavine, H. and Wechsler, J.—*War Propaganda in the United States.* 355 p. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, Conn. 1940.

Lerner, Max.—*Ideas Are Weapons.* Viking Press, N.Y. 1939. *Propaganda Analysis* Vols. I, II, III. 1938, 1939, 1940. Institute for Propaganda Analysis, Inc., New York.

Ponsby, Arthur.—*Falsehood in War Time.* Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 1929.

Magazines and Periodicals

American Magazine.—131:14-15, April, 1941. *Hitler's Slave Spies*

in America; Blitzkrieg of Blackmail. D. E. Keyhoe and Daly, J. J.

American Mercury.—52:417-25, April, 1941. *A B C of Sabotage.* J. Valtin.

Fortune.—22:88-9, November, 1940. *C. P. Column, Fifth Column, J. Stalin Still Has 100,000 Adherents.* 22: sup. 4, July, 1940. *Curbs for Trojan Horses.* Fortune Survey.

International Conciliation.—369:382-9, April, 1941. *Social Justice Within and Among Nations.* K. F. Lenroot.

Nation.—151:51, 73-4, 112-13, 153, 193-4, 244-5, 301-2, 364-5, 419-20, 475-6, 532-2, 657-8; 152:45-6, July 20, 1927; August 10, 1924; September 7, 1921; October 5, 1919; November 2, 1916; December 28, 1940; January 11, 1941. Within the Gates.

New Republic.—104:359-60, March 17, 1941. *Communist Teachers; Rapp-Coudert Investigation of New York City Colleges.* 104: 265, February 24, 1941. *Communist and Teachers; A. F. of T. Moves to Revoke 3 Chapters.* 103:886-7, December 30, 1940. *Nazi Innocents.*

Newsweek.—17:64, March 31, 1941. *Rout of Teaching Reds; Wholesale Ouster in New York.*

Nineteenth Century.—128:128-36, August, 1940. *Army of Pre-occupation.* A. G. Dickson.

Political Science Quarterly.—55:321-47, September, 1940. *Civil Liberties in War Time.* C. B. Swisher.

Saturday Evening Post.—213:9-10, February 15, 1941. *Muddled Millions: Capitalist Angels of Left Wing Propaganda.* B. Stolberg. 213:9-11, August 31, 1940. *Alien Poison.* Stanley High.

School and Society.—53:144-5, February 1, 1941. *Subversive Activities in New York City Colleges.*

Survey Graphic.—29:545-50, November, 1940. *Americans vs. Fifth Columnists: Symposium.*

Time.—37:73-5, March 17, 1941. *Reds in Manhattan.* 37:20, January 20, 1941. *Something Burning.* 35:14-15, July 24, 1940. *Attack From Within.*

Vital Speeches.—6:683-6, September 1, 1940. *America Is in Danger. Additional Argument.* August 18, 1940. W. C. Bullit. 6:720-4, September 15, 1940. *Must America Change Its Theory of Civil Liberties?* D. Meiklejohn. 6:654-5, August 15, 1940. *Civil Liberties in War Time.* C. Bok.

APPENDIX I

Topic Index of Debate Subjects Appearing in the Various Volumes of "Intercollegiate Debates"

Abandonment of Policy of Military Preparedness, *Vol. 12.*
Accident Insurance, *Vol. 4.*
Advertising, Modern, *Vol. 10*
Agricultural Adjustment Act, *Vol. 15.* (See also Cotton Control Program, *Vol. 17.*)
Agricultural Production Restrictions, *Vol. 22.*
Aid to the Allies, *Vol. 21.*
Alliance with Great Britain, *Vol. 19.*
Alliance of the Democracies, *Vols. 20, 21.*
Anglo-American Boycott on Japanese Goods, *Vol. 19.*
American Legion Should Be Condemned, *Vol. 14.*
Armed Intervention for Collection of Debts, *Vols. 1, 9.*
Arms and Munitions, Prevention of International Shipment, *Vol. 16.*
Nationalization of, *Vol. 17.*
Rearmament Program of the United States, *Vol. 20.*
Asset Currency, *Vol. 1.*
Athletics, Amateurism and Professionalism in, *Vol. 12.*
Balancing the Federal Budget, *Vol. 18.*
Banks, Government Control of, *Vol. 14.*
Bank Notes Secured by Commercial Paper, *Vol. 1.* (See also Asset Currency.)

Bonus (See American Legion.)
British vs. American System of Broadcasting, *Vol. 15.*
Cabinet System of Government, *Vols. 1, 3, 10.*
Cabinet Officers in Congress, *Vol. 4.*
Cancellation of War Debts, *Vols. 13, 14.*
Capitalism vs. Socialism
  Capitalism Is Unsound, *Vol. 13.*
  Social Control of Production and Exchange, *Vol. 7.*
  Limitation of Wealth, *Vols. 14, 16.*
Central Banks, *Vols. 1, 3.* (See Banks, Gov't Control of.)
Centralization of Power in Federal Government, *Vols. 9, 13.* (See also Control of Industry, Banks, Gov't Control of.) Power of Federal Government Increased, *Vol. 22.*
Chain Store, *Vol. 11.*
Child Labor, *Vol. 8.*
C.I.O., The Policies of the, *Vol. 18.*
City Manager Plan of Municipal Government, *Vol. 7.*
Civil Liberties, Maintaining, *Vol. 21.*
Closed and Open Shop, *Vols. 1, 3.*
Coal Mines, Government Ownership of, *Vol. 1.*
Co-education, *Vol. 10.*
Collective Bargaining by Non-Company Unions, *Vol. 16.*
Collective Bargaining in Mass-Production Industries, *Vol. 19.*
Commission Form of Municipal Government, *Vols. 1, 3.*
Compulsory Automobile Insurance, *Vol. 15.*

Compulsory Military Service, *Vols. 6, 22.* (See also Swiss Military System, *Vol. 7.*
Compulsory Reserve Officers Training Corps, *Vol. 17.*
Conservation of Natural Resources, *Vol. 2.*
Consumers' Co-operatives, *Vol. 18.*
Control of Industry, *Vol. 13.*
Cotton Control Program, *Vol. 17.*
Courts and Reform in Legal Procedure
  Abolition of Insanity Plea in Criminal Cases, *Vol. 10.*
  Abolition of Jury System, *Vol. 10.*
  Judges, Appointment vs. Election, *Vol. 1.*
  Judges, Recall of, *Vol. 2.*
  Judicial Decisions, Recall of, *Vol. 4.*
  Three-fourths Jury Decision, *Vol. 3.*
Crop Insurance, *Vol. 18.*
Cuba, Annexation of, *Vol. 1.*
Declaration of War by Popular Vote, *Vol. 8.*
Defense of Western Hemisphere, Union, *Vol. 22.*
Democracies, Alliance of, *Vols. 20, 21.*
Democracy vs. Dictatorship, *Vol. 15.*
Dictatorship, Presidential, *Vols. 14, 15.*
Diminishing the Power of the Federal Government, *Vol. 21.*
Direct Primary, *Vol. 3.*
Disarmament, International, *Vol. 11.* (See Abandonment of Policy of Military Preparedness.)
Divorce
  Divorce Is a Social Asset, *Vol. 13.*
  Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws, *Vol. 8.*
Dust Bowl, Improvement of the, *Vol. 21.*

Education
Amateurism vs. Professionalism in Athletics, *Vol. 12.*
Co-education, *Vol. 10.*
Federal Aid of Education, *Vol. 16.*
Federal Department of Education, *Vol. 9.*
Educational Qualification for Suffrage, *Vol. 1.*
Election of Senators by Popular Vote, *Vol. 1.*
Emergence of Women from the Home, *Vol. 12.*
Farm Relief
Agricultural Adjustment Act, *Vol. 15.*
Ever-Normal Granary Plan, *Vol. 19.*
McNary-Haugen Bill (Two debates), *Vol. 9.*
Fixing Prices of Staple Agricultural Products, *Vol. 13.*
Federal Aid to Education, *Vol. 16.*
Federal Charter for Interstate Commerce Corporations, *Vols. 1, 4.*
Federal Commission to control Press, *Vol. 22.*
Federal Control of Banks, *Vol. 14.*
Federal Control of the Express Business, *Vol. 5.*
Federal Control of Railroads, *Vol. 1.*
Federal Department of Education, *Vol. 9.*
Federation of English-speaking nations, *Vol. 22.*
Foreign Affairs
Governmental Principles of Mussolini, *Vols. 9, 11.*
Japanese Policy in Manchuria, *Vol. 14.*
Foreign Loans and Investments
Armed Intervention for Collection of, *Vols. 1, 9.*
Foreign Relations
Aid to the Allies, *Vol. 21.*
Alliance of the Democracies, *Vols. 20, 21.*

Foreign Relations—(*Continued*)
Alliance with Great Britain, *Vol. 19.*
Anglo-American Boycott Japanese Goods, *Vol. 19.*
Building United States Navy to Treaty Strength, *Vol. 15.*
Cancellation of War Debts, *Vols. 13, 14.*
Free Trade. (See also Tariff.)
In Raw Materials, *Vol. 2.*
International Free Trade, *Vol. 12.*
International Federal Union of the Democracies, *Vol. 21.*
Isolation Policy, *Vols. 20, 21.*
League of Nations, *Vols. 8, 10.*
Monroe Doctrine, *Vol. 5.*
Neutrality, Freedom of Action, and Alliances, *Vols. 19, 20.*
Open Door Policy in China, *Vols. 7, 20.*
Prevention of International Shipment of Arms and Munitions, *Vol. 16.*
Protective Tariff, Abandonment of, *Vols. 1, 2.*
Recognition of Soviet Russia, *Vol. 8.*
Free Speech, Denial to Aliens and Representatives of Hostile Governments, *Vol. 22.*
Government, Change in Form of
Cabinet Form of Government, *Vols. 1, 3, 10.*
Centralization of Power in Federal Government, *Vols. 9, 13.*
Diminishing the Power of the Federal Government, *Vol. 21.*
Educational Qualification for Suffrage, *Vol. 1.*
Election of Senators by Popular Vote, *Vol. 1.*

Government—(*Continued*)
Personal Liberty, Restriction by Government, *Vol. 9.*
Power of Supreme Court to Declare Laws Unconstitutional, *Vol. 8.*
Reorganization of the Federal Executive, *Vol. 19.*
Six Year Term for President, *Vol. 5.*
Government Ownership
Of All Means of Production, *Vol. 17.*
Of Coal Mines, *Vol. 1.*
Of Commercial Banking, *Vol. 18.*
Of Electric Utilities, *Vols. 17, 18.*
Of Hydro-Electric Power, *Vols. 10, 11.*
Of Merchant Marine, *Vol. 6.*
Of Public Utilities, *Vol. 16.*
Of Telegraph and Telephone, *Vol. 6.*
Of Railroads, *Vols. 4, 6, 7, 20, 21.*
Increasing Power of Federal Government, *Vol. 22.*
Government Policies
Annexation of Cuba, *Vol. 1.*
Conservation of Natural Resources, *Vol. 2.*
Direct Action to settle Strikes, *Vol. 22.*
Federal Aid to Education, *Vol. 16.*
Federal Commission to control Press, *Vol. 22.*
Independence of the Philippines, *Vol. 5.*
Restricting Agricultural Production, *Vol. 22.*
Ship Subsidy, *Vols. 1, 6.*
Spending to Stimulate Business, *Vols. 17, 20.*
Suppression of un-American Activities, *Vol. 21.*
Hitlerism, Advantages of, *Vol. 15.*
Hydro-Electric Power, Government Ownership and Control of, *Vols. 10, 11.*

Hours of Labor, 40-hour week, *Vol. 11.*
Immigration
  Japanese Immigration Law, *Vol. 8.*
  Literacy Test, *Vol. 5.*
  Restriction of, *Vol. 1.*
Improvement of the Dust Bowl, *Vol. 21.*
Income Tax, *Vols. 1, 2, 14, 16.* (See Limitation of Wealth.)
Incorporation, Federal, *Vols. 1, 4.* (See Federal Incorporation of Railroads, *Vol. 1.*)
Increase in Army and Navy, *Vols. 7, 20.* (Navy alone, *Vols. 1, 15.*)
Independence of Philippines, *Vol. 5.*
Industry, Control of, *Vol. 13.*
Inheritance Tax, *Vols. 1, 14, 16.*
Initiative and Referendum, *Vols. 1, 2.*
Injunction in Labor Disputes, *Vols. 1, 5.*
Insanity Plea in Criminal Cases, Abolishment of, *Vol. 10.*
Installment Buying, *Vol. 11.*
International Federal Union of the Democracies, *Vol. 21.*
International Free Trade, *Vol. 12.*
Interstate Commerce
  Advertising, Modern, *Vol. 10.*
  Chain Store, *Vol. 11.*
  Control of Industry, *Vol. 13.*
  Federal Charter for Interstate Commerce Corporations, *Vols. 1, 4.*
  Federal Control of Express Business, *Vol. 5.*
  Federal Control of Railroads, *Vol. 1.*

Interstate Commerce—(*Continued*)
Federal Control of Banks, *Vol. 14.*
Government Ownership of Public Utilities, *Vol. 16.*
Government Ownership of Railroads, *Vols. 4, 6, 7, 20, 21.*
Installment Buying, *Vol. 11.*
Reduction of Wages Retards Business Recovery, *Vol.* 13.
Regulations vs. Dissolution of Trusts, *Vol. 4.*
Isolation and Neutrality Policy of the United States, *Vols. 20, 21.*
Japanese Immigration, *Vol. 8.*
Japanese Policy in Asia, *Vol. 17.*
Japanese Policy in Manchuria, *Vol. 14.*
Judges, Appointment vs. Election of, *Vol. 1.*
Judges, Recall of, *Vol. 2.*
Judicial Decisions, Recall of, *Vol. 4.*
Judicial Review of Legislation, Limitation of, *Vol. 17.*
Jury System, Abolition of, *Vol. 10.*
Labor and Capital
Benefits of Labor Unions, *Vol. 1.*
Child Labor, *Vol. 8.*
Closed and Open Shop, *Vols. 1, 3.*
Collective Bargaining by Non-Company Unions, *Vol. 16.*
Collective Bargaining in Mass-Production Industries, *Vol. 19.*
Exemption of Labor Unions from Anti-trust Laws, *Vols. 7, 20.*
Forty-Hour Week, *Vol. 11.*
Incorporation of Labor Unions, *Vol. 20.*

Labor and Capital—(*Continued*)
Injunction in Labor Disputes, *Vols. 1, 5.*
Minimum Wage, *Vols. 3, 6, 18.*
Provisions of the N.R.A., *Vol. 15.*
Reduction of Wages, *Vol. 13.*
Union Closed Shop, *Vol. 19.*
Labor Unions, Benefits of, *Vol. 1.*
Exemption of from Anti-trust Laws, *Vol. 7.*
In Politics, *Vol. 20.*
Incorporation of, *Vol. 20.*
Larger Navy in the Pacific, *Vol. 19.*
League of Nations, *Vols. 8, 10.*
League Sanctions, United States Support for, *Vol. 17.*
Lend-Lease Bill, *Vol. 22.*
Light Wines and Beer, *Vol. 9.*
Liquor Control, *Vols. 8, 9, 12.*
Limitation of Incomes and Inheritances, *Vol. 16.*
Limitation of Wealth, *Vol. 14.*
Limiting Judicial Review of Legislation, *Vol. 17.*
Literacy Test for Immigrants, *Vol. 5.*
Maintaining Civil Liberties, *Vol. 21.*
McNary-Haugen Bill, *Vol. 9.*
Medicine, Socialized, *Vols. 12, 16.*
Merchant Marine, Government Ownership of, *Vol. 6.*
Merits of New Deal, *Vol. 16.*
Military Problems and War
Abandonment of Military Preparedness, *Vol. 12.*
Compulsory Military Service, *Vol. 6, 22.*
Compulsory R.O.T.C., *Vol. 17.*
Swiss System of Compulsory Military Service, *Vol. 7.*

Military Problems and War—(*Continued*)
Declaration of War by Popular Vote, *Vols. 8, 19.*
Increase in Army and Navy, *Vols. 1, 7.*
International Disarmament, *Vol. 11.*
Prevention of International Shipment of Arms and Munitions, *Vol. 16.*
Rearmament Program of the United States, *Vol. 20.*
Referendum on Declaration of War, *Vol.* 19.
Minimum Wages and Maximum Hours, *Vol. 18.*
Money and Banking
Asset Currency, *Vol. 1.*
Banks, Government Control of, *Vol. 14.*
Bank Notes Secured by Commercial Paper, *Vol. 1.*
Central Bank, *Vols. 1, 3.*
Control of Industry (Credit Control), *Vol. 13.*
Guarantee of Bank Deposits, *Vols. 1, 15.*
Postal Savings Banks, *Vol. 1.*
Stabilization of the Dollar, *Vol. 15.*
Monroe Doctrine, *Vol. 5.*
Municipal Government
Commission Form, *Vols. 1, 3.*
City Manager Plan, *Vol. 7.*
Mussolini, Governmental Principles of, *Vols. 9, 11.*
Nationalization of Arms and Munitions, *Vol. 17.*
N.R.A., Labor Provisions of, *Vol. 15.*
Navy
Building United States Navy to Treaty Strength, *Vol. 15.*
Larger Navy in the Pacific, *Vol. 19.*
Neutrality, Freedom of Action, and Alliances, *Vols. 19, 20.*

Neutrality Policy of the United States, *Vols. 19, 20.*
New Deal, Merits of, *Vol. 16.*
Old Age Insurance or Pension, *Vols. 4, 13, 16.*
Ontario Plan of Liquor Control, *Vol. 12.*
Open Door Policy in China, *Vols. 7, 20.*
Open vs. Closed Shop, *Vols. 1, 3.*
Personal Liberty, Restriction by Government, *Vol. 9.*
Postal Savings Banks, *Vol. 1.*
Power of Supreme Court, *Vol. 8.*
Power of Government. (See Centralization of Power.)
Press, Control by Federal Commission, *Vol. 22.*
Prohibition, *Vols. 8, 9, 12.*
Proportional Representation, *Vol. 21.*
Protective Tariff, *Vols. 1, 2.* (See also Free Trade.)
Radio Broadcasting, *Vols. 14, 15.*
Railroads
  Government Ownership of, *Vols. 4, 6, 7, 20, 21.*
  Federal Control of, *Vol. 1.*
Raw Materials, Free Trade in, *Vol. 2.*
Rearmament Program of the United States, *Vol. 20.*
Recognition of Russia, *Vol. 8.*
Reduction of Wages Retards Business Recovery, *Vol. 13.*
Referendum on Declaration of War, *Vol. 19.*
Reorganization of Federal Executive, *Vol. 19.*
Regulation vs. Dissolution of Trusts, *Vol. 4.* (See also Federal Control.)
Repeal of the Iowa General Sales Tax, *Vol. 17.*
Representation, Proportional, *Vol. 21.*
Restriction of Immigration, *Vols. 1, 5, 8.* (See Immigration.)

St. Lawrence Waterway, *Vol. 18.*
Sales Tax, Establishment of Uniform Retail, *Vol. 20.*
Sales Tax, Repeal of, *Vol. 17.*
Ship Subsidy, *Vol. 6.*
Short Ballot, *Vol. 2.*
Single Tax, *Vol. 6.*
Six Year Term for President, *Vol. 5.*
Social Insurance
  Accident, *Vol. 4.*
  Automobile, *Vol. 15.*
  Old Age, *Vols. 4, 13, 16.*
  Unemployment, *Vols. 11, 12, 13.*
Socialistic Control of Production and Exchange, *Vol. 7.*
Socialism, *Vol. 14.*
Socialized Medicine, *Vols. 12, 16.*
Soldier Bonus, *Vol. 14.* (See American Legion.)
Speech, Denial of Free Speech to Aliens, *Vol. 22.*
Stabilization of the Dollar, *Vol. 15.*
State Government, Reform and Change in
  Abolition of Insanity Plea in Criminal Cases, *Vol. 10.*
  Abolition of Jury System, *Vol. 10.*
  Appointment vs. Election of Judges, *Vol. 1*
  Compulsory Automobile Insurance, *Vol. 15.*
  Direct Primary, *Vol. 3.*
  Initiative and Referendum, *Vol. 3.*
  Recall of Judges, *Vol. 2.*
  Recall of Judicial Decisions, *Vol. 4.*
  Short Ballot, *Vol. 2.*
  State Medical Aid, *Vols. 12, 16.*

State Government—(*Continued*)
Three-fourths Jury Decision, *Vol. 3.*
Unicameral Legislature, *Vols. 5, 16.*
State Medical Aid, *Vols. 12, 16.*
Strikes, Direct Government action to settle, *Vol. 22.*
Suppression of un-American Activities, *Vol. 21.*
Supreme Court Reorganization, *Vol. 18.*
Swiss System of Compulsory Military Service, *Vol. 7.*
Tariff (See Free Trade, also Protection), *Vols. 1, 2, 12.*
Taxation
Income Tax, *Vols. 1, 2.*
Inheritance Tax, *Vol. 1.*
Intangible Property Tax, *Vol. 14.*
Limitation of Wealth by Income and Inheritance Taxes, *Vols. 14, 16.*
On Rental Value of Land, *Vol. 2.*
Sales Tax, *Vols. 17, 20.*
Single Tax, *Vol. 6.*
Telegraph and Telephone, Government Ownership of, *Vol. 6.*
Three-fourths Jury Decision, *Vol. 3.*
Townsend Plan for Old Age Pension, *Vol. 16.*
Trusts, *Vol. 4.* (See also Control of Industry, *Vol. 13.*)
Un-American Activities, Suppression of, *Vol. 21.*
Unemployment Insurance, *Vols. 11, 12, 13.*
Unicameral Legislature, *Vols. 5, 16.*
Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws, *Vol. 8.*
Union Closed Shop, *Vol. 19.*
United States Support for League Sanctions, *Vol. 17.*
United States in the War on the side of Great Britain, *Vol. 22.*

Universal Military Training, Before the age of twenty-one, *Vol. 22.*
Wages
Minimum Wages, *Vols. 3, 6, 18.*
Reduction of Wages, *Vol. 13.*
War
United States in the War on the side of Great Britain, *Vol. 22.*
Western Hemisphere, Union for its Defense, *Vol. 22.*
Working Week of Forty Hours, *Vol. 11.*

APPENDIX II

List of Tournament Results for the Debate Season of 1940-41 *

ALABAMA

Alabama College. Southern Province Pi Kappa Delta. April 2-5. Director: J. H. Henning. Montevallo, Ala. Participation: 18 colleges from 8 states, 12 men's, 8 women's teams. 8 rounds, percentage basis. Winners:

Debate, Men: 1st. Wake Forest College. 2nd. Johnson City College.

Debate, Women: 1st. Lenoir Rhyne College. 2nd. Maryville College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Earl Hunt, Tennessee State. 2nd. John Lewis, Stetson University. *Women*: 1st. Dorothy Steinbeck, Transylvania. 2nd. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne.

Extempe Speaking, Men: 1st. John Lewis, Statson University. 2nd. Bob Goldberg, Wake Forest. *Women*: 1st. Esther Bailey, Winthrop. 2nd Mary Beth Kuhn, Lenoir Rhyne.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Henry Wick, Maryville College. 2nd. Kent Herrin, Tennessee State.

* This list of tournament results is compiled from reports sent in by host colleges and tournament directors and from publications. If your tournament is not included, be instrumental in getting it re-reported in the future.

Alabama—(*Continued*)

Women: 1st. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne. 2nd. Dorothy Steinbeck, Transylvania.

Birmingham, Ala. Southern Association Tournament. 12th year. April 1-4. Director: Glenn R. Capp, Baylor University. Participation: 19 colleges, 11 states; 16 Men's teams, 10 Women's teams, 8 junior divisions. 6 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Union University. 2nd. Baylor University. 3rd. University of Alabama. *Women*: 1st. University of Alabama. 2nd. Hendrix College.

Junior Division: 1st. Louisiana State University. 2nd. St. Mary's, San Antonio, Texas.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Louisiana State University. 2nd. University of Alabama. *Women*: 1st. Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Baylor University.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Duke University. 2nd. University of Florida. *Women*: 1st. Baylor University. 2nd. Stetson University.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Louisiana Tech. 2nd. Baylor University. *Women*: 1st. Baylor University. 2nd. Southern Methodist.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas State Teachers College. Mid-South Tournament. 11th year. Sponsor: Arkansas Association of Teachers of Speech. Date: February 7, 8. Director: Robert Capel. Conway, Ark. Participation: 33 colleges from 10 states: 67

Arkansas—(*Continued*)

men's teams, 28 women's teams. 10 rounds. Elimination at 5th. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Missouri State Teachers College. (Springfield). 2nd. Louisiana State Normal. *Women*: 1st, East Central State Teachers, Ada, Okla. 2nd. Northeastern State Teachers, Tahlequah, Okla.

North Little Rock High School. Arkansas State Intercollegiate Tournament. Date March 7-8. Director: Robert Capel. No report.

CALIFORNIA

Bakersfield Junior College. Southern California Tournament Association. 4th year. Date: January 9, 10, 11. Director: Leonard McKaig. Place: Bakersfield. Participation: 21 colleges and junior colleges from 2 states. 15 men's teams, 3 women's teams; Junior Divisions, 28 men's teams, 12 women's teams. 9 rounds. 6th round elimination. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Pomona College. 2nd. Pepperdine College. *Women*: 1st. University of Redlands. *Lower Division Men*: 1st, Los Angeles City College. 2nd Pepperdine College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. University of Redlands. *Junior Men*: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. San Bernardino Junior College. *Junior Women*: 1st. Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Pomona Junior College.

California—(*Continued*)

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. University of Redlands. 2nd. Pasadena College. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. University of Southern California. 2nd. Tie: San Bernardino Junior College and Pepperdine College. *Women*: 1st. Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Arizona State (Tempe).

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. Pepperdine College.

Junior Men: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. University of Southern California.

Junior Women: 1st. Pepperdine College. 2nd. Reedley Junior College.

College of Pacific. Fifth Annual Junior College Tournament. Stockton, Calif. February 13-15. Director: Edward S. Betz. Participation: 43 teams from 3 states; 38 men's teams, and 5 women's teams. 7 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. University of Redlands. *Women*: 1st. Stockton Junior College. 2nd. Reedley Junior College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Yuba Junior College. 2nd. University of Redlands. *Women*: 1st. Stockton Junior College. 2nd. Bakersfield Junior College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. University of California at Los Angeles. 2nd. Pasadena Junior College. *Women*: 1st. Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Stockton Junior College.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Stockton Junior College. 2nd. Utah Agricultural College. *Women*:

California—(*Continued*)

1st. Stockton Junior College. 2nd. University of California at Los Angeles.

Progression: 1st. Pasadena Junior College. 2nd. Stockton Junior College.

College of Pacific. Pi Kappa Delta Province and Invitational Tournament. 14th year. Stockton, Calif. March 27-29. Director: Edward S. Betz. Participation: 78 teams from 7 states; 60 men's teams, 18 Women's teams. 9 rounds, eliminations at 6th round. Results:

Invitational Meet.

Debate, Men: 1st. University of Southern California. 2nd. University of Utah and U.S.C., tied. *Women*: 1st. College of Pacific. 2nd. Seattle Pacific.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Wayne Kuykendal, Linfield College. 2nd. William Biddick, College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. Marjorie Walters, Willamette University. 2nd. Reba June Long, University of Redlands.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Wallace Frasher, U.S.C. 2nd. William Biddick, College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. Eunice Hepler, Pepperdine. 2nd. Elna Schmitz, Washington State College.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Rowan Lunsford, Redlands. 2nd. George Kent, Occidental College. *Women*: 1st. Ella Williams, Pepperdine College. 2nd. Kathryn Devlin, University of Nevada.

Province Meet

Debate, Men: 1st. U.C.L.A. 2nd. College of Pacific and University of Redlands and Montana State

California—(*Continued*)

College tied. *Women*: 1st. Seattle Pacific College. 2nd. Linfield College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Wayne Kuykendal, Linfield College. 2nd. Wm. Biddick, College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. Reba June Long, University of Redlands. 2nd. Iola Whitlock, College of Pacific.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Wm. Biddick, College of Pacific. 2nd. Frank Wolf, U.C.L.A. *Women*: 1st. Norma Justin, Linfield College. 2nd. Margaret Stemmann, College of Pacific.

Impromptu Speaking Men: 1st, Rowan Lunsford, University of Redlands. 2nd. Wm. Biddick, College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. Reba June Long, University of Redlands. 2nd. Jacqueline Judge, College of Pacific.

Los Angeles City College. Invitational Tournament. 10th year. Los Angeles. March 6-8. Director: Edmund W. Doran. Participation: 20 colleges and junior colleges; 42 men's teams and 14 women's teams. Eleven rounds, elimination at 6th round. Results:

Lower Division.

Men's Debate: 1st. U.C.L.A. 2nd. University of Southern California. *Women*: 1st. U.C.L.A. 2nd. Glendale Junior College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Grover, U.S.C. 2nd. Kinnaman, U.S.C. *Women*: 1st. LaMar, Long Beach Junior College. 2nd. Reese L.A.C.C.

Oratorical Declamation, Men: 1st. Neil Hill, Pepperdine College. 2nd. Oliver Nichols, Pepperdine.

California—(*Continued*)

Women: 1st. Halie May Shearer, U.S.C. 2nd. Nancy Rowland, Pepperdine College.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Baird, U.S.C. 2nd. Grover, U.S.C. *Women*: 1st. Pius, U.C.L.A. 2nd. Schwabacher, U.C.LA.

Glendale Junior College. Conference Spring Meet. 4th year. Glendale, Calif. May 3. Director: J. D. Davis. Participation: 12 colleges and Junior Colleges of Southern California. Results:

Senior Division:

Radio, Men: 1st. Fred Bartlett, Occidental. 2nd. Sam Heenyiker, Pepperdine College. *Women*: 1st. Ruthanna Marble, Pepperdine College. 2nd. Reba June Long, University of Redlands.

Reading, Men: 1st. Bob Welch, Pomona College. 2nd. Fred Bartlett, Occidental College. *Women*: 1st. Reba June Long, University of Redlands. 2nd. Barbara Davis, LaVerne College.

After Dinner Speaking: *Men and women*: 1st. Reba June Long, University of Redlands. 2nd. Mary Carol Gribble, University of Southern California.

Lower Division:

Radio, Men: 1st. Al Carmona, L.A.C.C. 2nd. Rodger Eddy, Glendale Junior College. *Women*: 1st. Marsha LaBach, Compton Junior College. 2nd. Annette Finderson, Pasadena Junior College.

Reading, Men: 1st. Lamont Johnson, Pasadena Junior College. 2nd. Roland Hutchinson, L.A.C.C. *Women*: 1st. Gloria Spear, Glendale Junior College. 2nd. Halie May Shearer, U.S.C.

California—(*Continued*)

After Dinner Speaking, Men and Women: 1st. Pete Nakahara, Compton Junior College. 2nd. Bob Mercer, Compton Junior College.

Pasadena Junior College. Phi Rho Pi Pacific Coast District Tournament. Pasadena, Calif. March 28-29. Director: J. D. Davis. Participation: 7 Pacific Coast chapters of Phi Rho Pi. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Glendale Junior College. 2nd. Los Angeles City College. *Women*: 1st. Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Pomona Junior College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Ralph Palla, Bakersfield. 2nd. Joe Okarski, Pomona Junior College. *Women*: 1st. Florence McKaig, Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Beverley Parks, Bakersfield Junior College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Wayne Warrington, Glendale Junior College. 2nd. Harold Jackson, Bakersfield Junior College. *Women*: 1st. Florence McKaig, Bakersfield Junior College. 2nd. Elaine Forsander, Long Beach Junior College.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Milton Dobkin, Los Angeles City College. 2nd. Kenneth Rhoades, Long Beach Junior College. *Women*: 1st. Elizabeth Maxfield, Long Beach. 2nd. Jean Campbell, Pasadena Junior College.

Pepperdine College. Western Association Teachers of Speech Tournament. 9th year. Los Angeles. November 18-20. Director: J. H. Baccus. Participation: 34 colleges and junior colleges from 7 states; 42 men's teams; 116 women's teams; 44

California—(*Continued*)

lower division men's teams; 22 Lower Division women's teams; B Division 24 men's teams; 6 women's teams. (B division debates not judged) 9 rounds, elimination at 6th round. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. U.S.C. 2nd. U.S.C. *Women*: 1st. U.S.C. 2nd. Tie: University of Redlands, Willamette University. *Lower Division Men*: 1st. U.S.C. 2nd. Tie: Bakersfield Junior College, College of Pacific, San Francisco State. *Lower Division Women*: 1st. U.S.C. 2nd. Tie: Long Beach, College of Pacific.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Hoose, U.S.C. 2nd. Lachenmyer, Linfield College. *Women*: 1st. Morton, U.S.C. 2nd. Eberhard, U.S.C. *Lower Division Men*: 1st. Nichols, Pepperdine. 2nd. Kuykendal, Linfield College. *Lower Division Women*: 1st. Bourland, Pepperdine College. 2nd. Whitaker, El Centro.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Bolton, U.S.C. 2nd. Lane, U.S.C. *Women*: 1st. Baker, U.S.C. 2nd. Justin, Linfield College. *Lower Division Men*: 1st. Gate, Pacific University. 2nd. Skousen, San Bernardino Junior College. *Lower Division Women*: 1st. Bourland, Pepperdine College. 2nd. Williams, Pepperdine College.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Occidental College. 2nd. Olds, Willamette University. *Women*: 1st. Gribble, U.S.C. 2nd. Eisenbise, LaVerne. *Lower Division Men*: 1st. Baird, U.S.C. 2nd. Armstrong, Pepperdine College. *Lower Division*

California—(*Continued*)

Women: 1st. Davis, Reedley Junior College. 2nd. Schumacker, U.C.L.A.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Edwards, Whitman College. 2nd. Hoose, U.S.C. *Women*: 1st. Reba June Long, University of Redlands. 2nd. LaFollette, U.S.C. *Lower Division Men*: 1st. McWain, Willamette University. 2nd. Bunch, Bakersfield Junior College. *Lower Division Women*: 1st. Vanberg, Linfield.

Progression Discussion, Senior Division: 1st. Oliver, U.C.L.A. 2nd. Hinds, University of Denver. *Lower Division*: 1st. Payne, Santa Barbara State College. 2nd. Bourland, Pepperdine College. *B. Division, Men*: Tie: U.S.C. teams. *Women*: Tie: 2 U.S.C. Teams.

COLORADO

University of Denver. Rocky Mountain Speech Conference. 10th year. Denver. February 14-16. Director: Dr. Elwood Murray. No report on results.

CONNECTICUT

Wesleyan University. Big Three-Little Three Tournament. Middletown, Conn. February 14-15. Director: Wilbert Snow. Participation: Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Amherst, Williams, Wesleyan. Results: 1st. Yale University. 2nd. Amherest College. Individual honors: Melvin A

Connecticut—(*Continued*)

Anderson, Jr. Princeton University. 2nd. S. Chadwick Reed, Wesleyan University.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Tau Kappa Alpha. Second National Discussion Conference. Hotel Continental, Washington, D.C. December 31, January 1, 2, 1941. Director: Hale Aarnes of University of So. Dakota. Participation: 9 colleges, 63 men and women in seven stages of discussion. Superior ratings won by: Paul Rogers, University of Florida, William Jordan, Moorhead Teachers College, John Metzger, Muhlenberg College, Joseph Hart, Kent State College, William Cline, Bridgewater College, Marjorie Jacot, Kent State College and Warren Howell, Denison University. Excellent rating: Grant McClanahan, Muskingum College, Plyna Gilchris, Western State Teachers College, Lester Griffen, Western State Teachers College, Ted Brown, Denver University, Winto Solberg, University of So. Dak., Earl Cain, University of So. Dak., Hazel Bright, Moorhead State Teachers College.

FLORIDA

Stetson University. Florida State Practice Tournament. 4 years. DeLand. Director: Lydia A. Theurer. Participation: 5 Florida colleges. 3 rounds-no-decision. Non-competitive After Dinner Speaking.

Florida—(*Continued*)

Extempore speaking: 1st. John Lewis, Stetson University.

IDAHO

Boise Junior College. Southern Idaho Speech Conference. 3 years. Boise. December 6, 7. Director: Dr. C. D. Myers. Participation: 7 colleges. Senior Division, men and women, 16 teams. Lower Division, 11 teams. 8 rounds, elimination at 5th round. Results:

Debate, Senior Division: 1st. College of Idaho. 2nd. Northwest Nazarene College. *Lower Division*: 1st. College of Idaho. 2nd. Boise Junior College.

Oratory, Men and Women: 1st. Ellis Boden, Albion Normal. 2nd. Darwin Craner, Lewiston.

Extempore Speaking, Men and Women: 1st. Ward Hower, Lewiston. 2nd. Hugh McDowell, Northwest Nazarene College.

ILLINOIS

Illinois State Normal University. Invitational Tournament. 9th year. Normal, Ill. January 10, 11. Director: F. L. D. Holmes. Participation: 32 colleges from 6 states. 20 men's teams, 12 women's teams, in Championship Division; Division I (Experienced debaters) 72 teams from 29 colleges. Division II (Less experienced) 52 teams from 18 colleges. Divisions I and II non-decision. Results, 6 rounds:

Championship Division Men: 1st. Tie: (5 out of 6)

Illinois—(*Continued*)

Kirksville State Teachers, Normal University Westminster College. *Women*: 1st. (5 out of 6) Coe College. 2nd. Tie: (4 out of 6) South Illinois Normal University, Illinois State Normal University, and North Illinois State Teachers College.

Milliken University. Illinois Intercollegiate Debate League Tournament. 6th year. Decatur, Ill. March 14-15. Director: L. C. McNabb. Participation: 18 Illinois Colleges, 34 men's and 22 women's teams. Championship type, 6 round elimination. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Loyola University, Affirmative. Illinois Wesleyan, Negative. *Women*: 1st. Lake Forest, Affirmative. Illinois State Normal, Negative.

Eastern Illinois State Teachers College. Invitational Tournament. 4th year. Charleston, Ill. February 1. Director: J. G. Ross. Participation: 15 colleges from 4 states; 36 men's teams and 24 women's teams. 4 rounds with classification at end. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Lake Forest College. 2nd. Tie: Illinois College, Southern Illinois State Normal, and Principia.

North Central College. Pi Kappa Delta Province of Illinois. Naperville, Ill. March 20-21. Director: Prof. Guy E. Oliver. Participation: Illinois and Wisconsin chapters of Pi Kappa Delta. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Wheaton College, North Central, Carroll.

Illinois—(*Continued*)

Women: 1st. Illinois Normal, DeKalb Teachers, Charleston-Wheaton tie.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Harold L. Hayes, Charleston. 2nd. Donald Hoke, Wheaton. *Women*: 1st. Elizabeth Junker, Bradley Polytechnic. 2nd. Betty Lee Hageman, Monmouth College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Guy Oliver, Junior North Central. 2nd. Lyle York, Wheaton. *Women*: 1st. Margaret Baum, DeKalb Teachers. 2nd. Effie Lou Crane, Illinois Normal.

Sweepstakes: Wheaton College.

INDIANA

Indiana University. Novice Tournament. Bloomington, Ind. February 8. No report.

Manchester College. Manchester-Huntington Invitational Tournament. 11 years. Place: North Manchester and Huntington, Ind. February 24-25. Director: George Beauchamp. Participation: 67 colleges from 9 states. 262 debate teams. Classification at end of 6 rounds. Results:

Debate, Undefeated Teams: At Manchester: Pasadena (Calif.) Negative; Goshen II, Negative; Manchester I, Negative; Notre Dame I, Affirmative; Northern Illinois State Teachers I, Negative; Wayne University IV, Negative. At Huntington: Manchester IV, Affirmative; Wabash College I, Negative; Michigan State College I, Affirmative; Muskingum College II, Negative.

IOWA

Iowa Wesleyan University. Practice Tournament. 3rd. year. Mt. Pleasant, Iowa. February 1. Director: Harold Nelson. Participation: 6 colleges from Iowa. 4 rounds non-decision.

Iowa Wesleyan University. Quadrangular meet. 1st. year. Mt. Pleasant. February 19. Director: Harold Nelson. Participation: 4 colleges from 3 states. 2 rounds, critic judge but non-decision.

Morningside College. Pi Kappa Delta, Province of the Sioux. Sioux City, Iowa. March 27-29. Director: Mendal B. Miller. Participation: Pi Kappa Delta chapters from North and South Dakota and Northern Iowa. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Jamestown College. 2nd. Sioux Falls College. *Women*: 1st. Tie: Northern Normal and Sioux Falls College. 2nd Augustana College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Roger Frederickson, Sioux Falls College. 2nd. Jules Jorgenson, Augustana College. *Women*: 1st. June Balmeier, Jamestown College. 2nd. Clarice Evers, Yankton College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Kenneth Raschke, Augustana College. 2nd. Fred Davenport, Morningside College. *Women*: 1st. Jean Park, Sioux Falls College. 2nd. Virginia Ford, South Dakota State College.

University of Iowa. Freshman-Sophomore Tournament. Iowa City. November 16, 1940. Direc-

Iowa—(*Continued*)

tor: William Roskam. Participation: 14 colleges, 28 teams, half Affirmative and half Negative. Results:

Debate: Affirmative: 1st. Iowa Wesleyan. 2nd. Tie: Iowa Teachers, Augustana, and Ft. Dodge. Negative: 1st. Upper Iowa and University of Iowa—tie. Ranking of Colleges, both Affirmative and Negative: Tie: (6 of 8) Iowa Teachers, Iowa Wesleyan and Ft. Dodge.

University of Iowa. Iowa Invitational Tournament. Iowa City. March 6, 7, 8. Director: William Roskam. Participation: 18 colleges from 11 states. 19 Affirmative teams and 19 Negative teams. Results:

Debate: Affirmative: 1st. Tie: Carleton College, University of Wichita—undefeated. 6 rounds. Negative: 1st. University of Iowa (undefeated rounds) 2nd. (5 out of 6) Tie: Carleton College and Sioux Falls College. Ranking of Colleges in both Affirmative and Negative: 1st. Carleton College (11 out of 12). 2nd. University of Iowa (10 out of 12). 3rd. Wichita (9 out of 12) and Sioux Falls College (9 out of 12).

Oratory: 1st. or Excellent, Norman Krause, University of Iowa; Edward Greenough, Sioux Falls College; Bob Ray, Coe College; Gordon Carlson, South Dakota State; Janice Shuler, Hastings College. 2nd. or Good: Don Hoke, Wheaton College; Joe Mohr, University of Wichita; Jim Kenna, University of Denver.

Iowa—(*Continued*)

Extempore Speaking: 1st. or Superior: Joe Kilgore, University of Texas. 2nd. or Excellent: Lyle York, Wheaton College; Roland Christenson, University of Iowa; Richard Springgate, Purdue University. 3rd. or Good: Ray Huevler, Marquette University; Richard Crabbs, University of Denver.

After Dinner Speaking: 1st. Gordon Carlson, South Dakota State. 2nd. John Mundt, DePauw University, and Tom Law, University of Texas.

Progression, Men: Finalists: Tom Law, Texas; Robert Vessey, South Dakota State; Richard Stark, DePauw; W. M. White, Purdue University; Carl Joseph, Toledo; Mark Keane, Purdue University. *Women*: Ruth Arnald, Sioux Falls College; Mary Murphy, University of Denver; Martha Law, University of Iowa; Janice Shuler, Hastings College; Jean Park, Sioux Falls College. Marjorie Lersch, Iowa; Hilda Specter, University of Wichita.

University of Iowa. Junior College League Tournament. Iowa City. March 27, 28. Director: Orville Pence. Participation: 8 Iowa Junior Colleges. 8 rounds, percentage of wins. Results:

Debate: 1st. Fort Dodge. 2nd. Maquoketa.

Oratory: 1st. Russell Bryan, Red Oak. 2nd. Calvin DeVries, Northwestern; 3rd. Michael Cuff, Ft. Dodge.

Extempore Speaking: 1st. Elbert Dempsey, Graceland. 2nd. Mary Ann Van Beek, Maquoketa.

Iowa—(*Continued*)

Interpretative Reading: Rating of Excellent: Russell Bryan, Red Oak; Virginia Hammond, Mount St. Clare; Karl Larson, Ft. Dodge; Beulah Stowe, Ft. Dodge; Orin Walleck, Tipton.

Radio Speaking: First rank: Arlene Armstrong, Ft. Dodge; Russell Bryan, Red Oak; Robert Conrad, Elkader; Tom McKay, Graceland.

KANSAS

Pittsburg State Teachers College. Tri-State Tournament. 15 years. Pittsburg, Kans. November 15-16, 1940. Director: J. R. Pelsma. Participation: 22 Junior College and Lower Division teams from 3 states. 6 rounds. Results:

Debate: 1st. Kansas City Junior College. 2nd. Muskogee Junior College (Okla.)

Bethel College: Pi Kappa Delta, Province of the Plains. North Newton, Kans. March 21-22. Director: Albert H. Burrows. Participation: 19 of 22 chapters in Kansas, Nebraska, and Colorado, and 1 petitioning college. 20 men's teams, and 8 teams. B Division, 17 teams. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Nebraska Wesleyan. 2nd. Kearney State Teachers. *Women*: 1st. McPherson College. 2nd. Pittsburg Teachers College. B. Division: 1st. McPherson College. 2nd. Hastings College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. James Tipton, Nebraska Wesleyan. 2nd. Don Marsh, Hastings College.

Kansas—(*Continued*)

Women: 1st. Janice Shuler, Hastings College. 2nd. Jacqueline Wilken, Colorado State.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Ernest Peterson, McPherson. 2nd. James Tipton, Nebraska Wesleyan. *Women*: 1st. Clara Jo Hopkins, Nebraska Wesleyan. 2nd. Waynona Newcome, Pittsburg State Teachers College.

Public Discussion: 1st. Richard Nicholas, Nebraska Wesleyan. 2nd. Bob Briley, Pittsburg Teachers. *Women*: 1st. Marion Burrows, Chadron State Teachers College. 2nd. Tie: Barthena Grigsby, Bethany College and Janice Shuler, Hastings College.

Southwestern University. Interstate College Debate Tournament. 13 years. Winfield, Kans. November 22-23, 1940. Director: J. Thompson Baker. Participation: 50 colleges from 10 states, over 100 teams. 6 practice rounds and classification. Results:

Debate, Superior: (Undefeated) 3 teams, colleges not designated. *Women*: 4 teams, colleges not designated. Junior Division 3 teams, colleges not designated.

KENTUCKY

Murray State Teachers College. Invitational Tournament. Director: M. C. LaFollette. No report.

Transylvania College. Round Robin Tournament. Lexington, Ky. March 1. Director: Pearl An-

Kentucky—(*Continued*)

derson. Participation: 6 Kentucky Colleges. 12 men's, 10 women's and 12 Junior Division teams. Results not given.

LOUISIANA:

Louisiana State Normal. Invitational Tournament. Natchitoches, La. Director: R. L. Ropp. No report 1941.

MICHIGAN

Michigan State College. Pi Kappa Delta, Province of the Lakes. East Lansing. March 31-April 1. Director: J. D. Menchhofer. Participation: 14 chapters from Ohio and Michigan, 90 delegates; 14 men's teams and 6 women's teams. Results:

Debate Men: 1st. Heidelberg University. 2nd. University of Akron. *Women*: 1st. Michigan Central State Teachers. 2nd. University of Akron.

Oratory, Men: 1st. John Haines, Hope College. 2nd. Gilbert Thomas, University of Akron. *Women*: 1st. Mary Elaine Childs, Mich. State College. 2nd. Julia Sweedenberg, University of Akron.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Lawrence Kuhl, Bowling Green State College. 2nd. Walter Slowinski, St. Vincent. *Women*: 1st. Carol Sayers, Kent State College. 2nd. Juanita Chauncey, University of Akron.

Radio, Men: 1st. M. D'Asare, Bowling Green College. 2nd. F. Van Voorhees Grove City College (Pa.)

MINNESOTA

Concordia College. Red River Valley Tournament. 8th year. Moorhead, Minn. February 7-8. Director: W. F. Schmidt. Participation: 38 colleges, 394 contestants, 3 states. 6 rounds before elimination, then quarter finals and on to championship. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. St. Olaf College. *Women*: 1st. Northern Teachers College, South Dakota. 2nd. River Falls College.

Debate, Industrial Rating, Men: 1st. Don Eastvold, St. Olaf College. *Women*: 1st. Tie: Jean Park, Sioux Falls College. Losi Radetz, Macalester College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Albert Anderson, St. Olaf. *Women*: 1st. June Bolmeier, Jamestown College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Gene Halvorsen, Macalester College. *Women*: 1st. Jean Park, Sioux Falls College.

Extemporaneous Argument, Men: 1st. George Collins, St. Olaf. *Women*: 1st. Faythe Mantel, Northern Teachers, South Dakota.

Discussion, Men: 1st. Edward Greenough, Sioux Falls College. *Women*: 1st. Hazel Johnson, Augustana College. (So. Dakota.)

Radio Discussion: 1st. Edward Greenough, Sioux Falls College.

Poetry Reading: Jean Park, Sioux Falls College.

Sweepstakes: 1st. Sioux Falls College. 2nd. Augustana College. 3rd. St. Olaf College.

Minnesota—(*Continued*)

College of St. Thomas. Northwest Debate Tournament. 10 years. St. Paul. March 3, 4, 5 Director: Owen P. McElmeel. Participation: 42 colleges from 9 states. Limited to 4 year colleges. 11 rounds, 8 round elimination, undefeated and 1 defeat continuing to championship, dropping out when losing. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. St. Olaf College. 2nd. College of St. Thomas.

Concordia College. Red River Valley Tournament. No report.

MISSISSIPPI

Millsaps College. Invitational Tournament. 3 years. Jackson, Miss. December 6, 7, 1940. Director: E. S. Wallace. Participation: 18 colleges and junior colleges, from 7 states. 28 men's and 18 women's teams. 4 preliminary rounds, elimination by 1 defeat thereafter. Teams winning 2 out of 4 continue. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. North Texas State Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Mississippi College. *Women*: 1st. Northeast Okla. Teachers College, Tahlequah. 2nd. North Texas Teachers, Denton. *Junior Division*: 1st. North Texas State Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway. *Consolation Division or B Division*: 1st. Mississippi State College, Starkville. 2nd. Louisiana College, Pineville.

Oratory: 1st. Harwell Dobbs, Millsaps College.

Mississippi—(*Continued*)

2nd. Jack Robbins, North Texas State Teachers College.

Extempore Speaking: 1st. Norman Dowty, Louisiana State Normal Natchitoches. 2nd. James White, Southwest Oklahoma State Teachers, Durant.

MISSOURI

Northeast Missouri Teachers College. Mid-West Tournament. 4th year. Kirksville, Mo. December 6-7. Director: Clifton Cornwell. Participation: 22 colleges from 3 states; 18 men's and 12 women's and 16 Junior Division teams. 4 rounds and winner determined on percentage basis. Preseason practice and classification. Results: Not reported.

Wenworth Military Academy. Invitational Junior Division tournament. 1st. year. Lexington, Mo. February 1, 1941. Director: Capt. D. C. Buck. Participation: 10 colleges from 2 states. 20 teams. 5 rounds, with winner determined on percentage basis. Results:

Debate: 1st. Kansas City Junior College (Kansas). 2nd. Fort Scott Junior College (Kansas).

Westminster College. Missouri State Junior College Tournament. Fulton, Mo. February 28, 1941. Participation: 4 Junior Colleges. Results:

Debate: 1st. Wentworth Military Academy. 2nd. Tie: Kemper Military School and St. Paul's College.

William Jewell College. Pi Kappa Delta Province of

Missouri—(*Continued*)

Missouri Meet. Place: Elms Hotel, Excelsior Springs. Director: Province Governor, Miss Cunera Van Emerik. Participation: Pi Kappa Delta Chapters of Iowa and Missouri. Results: *Debate, Men*: 1st. Superior rating: Park College, Northeast Missouri Teachers (Kirksville). 2nd. Excellent rating: Simpson College, Coe College, Central College (Iowa), Central College (Mo.) *Women*: 1st. Superior: Coe College, Central (Iowa), and Simpson College. 2nd. Excellent: Park College, Central (Mo.), Northeastern Missouri Teachers (Kirksville).

Oratory, Men: 1st. Superior: Bob Ray, Coe College; Robert Newman, Northeastern Teachers (Kirksville); Rex Scott, Park College. 2nd. Excellent: K. Shank, Simpson College; Jeffrey Fleece, Central (Mo.); Dick Brown, Iowa Wesleyan. *Women*: 1st. Superior: Dorothy Schrader, Park College; Audrey Williams, William Jewell College; Carolyn Elder, Simpson College. 2nd. Excelent: Virginia Van Gorp, Central (Iowa).

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Superior: Clifton Cornwell, Jr., Northeastern Teachers (Kirksville); Walter Burks, Maryville Teachers. 2nd. Excellent: Richard Heilbron, William Jewell College; Rex Scott, Park College; Charles McManaman, Coe College; James Angell, Simpson College. *Women*: 1st. Superior: Dorothy Schrader, Park College; Loraine Rowlings, Coe College. 2nd. Excellent: Ruth Williams, Northeastern Teachers

Missouri—(*Continued*)

(Kirksville); Audrey Williams, William Jewell College.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Superior: Ruth Williams, Kirksville; Dorothy Schrader, Park College; Virginia Ann Gorp, Central (Iowa); Audrey Williams, William Jewell College. 2nd. Excellent: Gale Jordan, Missouri Valley College; Jeffrey Fleece, Central (Mo.); Helen Knox, Coe College.

Sweepstakes Winners: Park College, Kirksville Teachers, Coe College.

MONTANA

Montana University. Treasure State Tournament. No report.

NEBRASKA

Nebraska Wesleyan. Invitational Tournament. No report.

Omaha University. Invitational Tournament. No report.

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State Teachers College. Appalachian Mountain Tournament. 7th year. Boone, N. C. February 7, 8. Director: J. D. Rankin. Participation: 12 colleges from 4 states; 20 men's, 12 women's teams. Classification at end of 7 rounds. 3 rounds direct clash debating, 4 rounds standard form. Results:

North Carolina—(*Continued*)

Debate, Individual, Men: 1st. Tom Daugherty, Appalachian College. 2nd. Earl Hunt, Tennessee Teachers College, Johnson City. *Women*: 1st. Marjorie Rosen, Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Jane Forrester, Virginia Intermont.

Direct Clash Debate: 1st. Brice Ratchford, North Carolina State College. 2nd. Earl Hunt, Tennessee Teachers College, Johnson City.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Tie: J. B. Harris, Emory and Henry College and J. W. Dixon, Emory and Henry College. 2nd. Dick Proctor, Mars Hill College. *Women*: 1st. Kathryn McGrimsey, Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Marjorie Freels, Virginia Intermont.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Kent Herrin, East Tennessee Teachers College, Johnson City; C. D. Hounshell, Emory and Henry College. *Women*: 1st. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne College. 2nd. Marjorie Freels, Virginia Intermont.

Lenoir Rhyne College. South Atlantic Tournament. 9th year. Hickory, N. C. March 6-8. Director: Albert Keiser. Participation: 9 colleges from 3 states. 12 men's, 8 women's teams. 8 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. East Tennessee Teachers College, Johnson City. 2nd. Tie: Lenoir Rhyne College and Wake Forest College. *Women*: 1st. Lenoir Rhyne College. 2nd. Winthrop College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Tom Daugherty, Appalachian College. 2nd. Earl Hunt, Johnson City Teachers

North Carolina—(*Continued*)

College. *Women*: 1st. Judith Joyner, Appalachian College. 2nd. Esther Bailey, Winthrop College.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Nat Welch, Furman University. 2nd. Earl Hunt, Johnson City Teachers College. *Women*: 1st. Betty Grothe, Lenoir Rhyne.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Kent Herrin, Johnson City Teachers. 2nd. Bruce Brown, Wake Forest College. *Women*: 1st. Bernice Gillespie, Winthrop College. 2nd. Mary Beth Kuhn, Lenoir Rhyne.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Marshall Mauney, Lenoir Rhyne. 2nd. Kent Herrin, Johnson City Teachers College. *Women*: 1st. Beth Pascoe, Maryville College. 2nd. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne College.

Radio Reading, Men: 1st. Wilfred Hahn, Lenoir Rhyne College. 2nd. Weston Hatfield, Wake Forest College. *Women*: 1st. Betty Story, Lenoir Ryhne. 2nd. Judith Joyner, Appalachian College.

Radio Address, Men: 1st. Weston Hatfield, Wake Forest. 2nd. Tom Daugherty, Appalachian College.

Radio News Cast, Men: Bob Goldberg, Wake Forest. *Women*: Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne.

Radio Extempore, Men: 1st. Weston Hatfield, Wake Forest. 2nd. Marshall Mauney, Lenoir Rhyne. *Women*: 1st. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne. 2nd. Esther Bailey, Winthrop College.

Problem Solving, Men: 1st. Connolly Gamble, Le-

North Carolina—(*Continued*)

noir Rhyne. 2nd. Randy Russell, Furman University. *Women*: 1st. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne. 2nd. Janet Lindsay, Maryville College.

Group Discussion, Men: 1st. Charles Wessinger, Lenoir Rhyne. 2nd. Terry Mattern, Appalachian College. *Women*: 1st. Frances McMahon, Winthrop College. 2nd. Alda Gregory, Lenoir Rhyne.

Formulating Group Opinion, Men: 1st. Bob Goldberg, Wake Forest. 2nd. Tom Daugherty, Appalachian College. *Women*: 1st. Cleo Jones, Appalachian College. 2nd. Mary Beth Kuhn, Lenoir Rhyne.

North Carolina State Teachers College. Skyland Forensic Meet. Asheville, N. C. April 12. No report.

Wingate Junior College. Phi Rho Pi National Tournament. Charlotte, N. C. April 6-10, 1941. Director: Carolyn Caldwell. Participation: 27 chapters of Phi Rho Pi. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Kilgore College (Texas). 2nd. El Reno Junior College (Okla.) *Women*: 1st. Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Weber College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Anthony Charmoli, Virginia Junior College (Minn.) 2nd. Milton Dobkin, Los Angeles City College. *Women*: 1st. Betty Swidensky, Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Betty Peterson, Eastern State Normal School (So. Dak.)

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Bernard Coyle, Los Angeles City College. 2nd. George Kapel, Stockton Junior College (Calif.) *Women*: 1st. Jane

North Carolina—(*Continued*)

Forester, Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Betty Kaner, Eveleth Junior College (Minn.)

Radio Speaking: 1st. Mark Austad, Weber College. 2nd. George Kapel, Stockton Junior College.

OHIO

Baldwin-Wallace College. Great Lakes Tournament. 2nd year. Berea, O. March 7-8. Director: Dana T. Burns. Participation: 16 colleges from 5 states; 22 men's teams. 5 rounds. Contests in debate, Impromptu, Radio and Shakespearean Reading. Winners of individual contests not reported. Winner of most points in all events: University of Pittsburgh.

Bowling Green College. Invitational Tournament. 2nd year. Bowling Green, Ohio. December 6. Director: Upton Palmer. Participation: 10 colleges from Ohio. 42 teams. 3 rounds for practice. No winners.

Capital University. State Intercollegiate Tournaments. No report for 1941.

OKLAHOMA

East Central State Teachers College. Invitational Tournament. Ada, Okla. December 1940. Director: D. J. Nabors. Participation: Colleges from 6 states. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Oklahoma University. 2nd. Louisiana State Normal. *Women*: 1st. Northeastern State Teachers, Tahlequah, Okla. 2nd. North-

Oklahoma—(*Continued*)

western Teachers, Alva, Okla. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. Muskogee Junior College. 2nd. Panhandle A. and M. College. *Women*: 1st. North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Ouachita College. *Mixed Debate*: 1st. Oklahoma Baptist College. 2nd. Ouachita College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Springfield (Mo.) Teachers College. 2nd. North Texas Teachers College, Denton. *Women*: 1st. Mary-Hardin Baylor College. 2nd. North Texas State Teachers College, Denton.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Pittsburg (Kans.) Teachers College. 2nd. Oklahoma University. *Women*: 1st. North Texas Teachers College, Denton. 2nd. Pittsburg (Kans.) Teachers College.

Poetry Reading, Men: 1st. Louisiana State Normal, Natchitoches. 2nd. Pittsburg (Kans.) State Teachers. *Women*: 1st. Betheny Peniel College. 2nd. Ouachita College.

Radio, Men: Kansas Wesleyan. 2nd. Kilgore Junior College. *Women*: 1st. North Texas State Teachers, Denton. 2nd. North Texas Teachers, Denton.

After Dinner Speaking: 1st. North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Southeastern State Teachers Durant, Okla.

Northeastern State Teachers College. Northeastern Junior College Tournament. 10th year. Tahlequah. January 10-11. Director James Robinson. Participation: 10 colleges from 3 states; 30 teams. 8 rounds, with elimination at 5th round. Results:

Oklahoma—(*Continued*)

Debate: 1st. University of Oklahoma. Lower Division. 2nd. East Central Teachers.

Oratory: 1st. Eugene Richeson, East Central Teachers, Ada. 2nd. Paul Swinford, East Central Teachers, Ada.

Extempore Speaking: 1st. Robert Loeffler, University of Oklahoma. 2nd. Paul Swinford, East Central Teachers, Ada.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Kathleen Williams, Northeastern Teachers, Tahlequa. 2nd. Pauline Higgins, East Central Teachers, Ada.

Southeastern State Teachers College. 12th Savage Forensic Tournament. Durant, Okla. February 27, 28, March 1, 1941. Director: Tom Houston. No report.

University of Oklahoma. Third Mid-West Tournament. Norman, Okla. February 14, 15. Director: Lee Murphy. No report.

OREGON

Linfield College. 11th Northwest Invitational Tournament. McMinnville, Oregon. February 20, 21, 22. Director: R. D. Mahaffey. Participation: 27 colleges from 5 states, 35 men's, 14 women's and 38 Junior Division teams. 10 rounds, elimination at 7th round.

Debate, Men: 1st. Washington State College. 2nd College of Pacific. *Women*: 1st. College of Pacific. 2nd. Linfield College. *Junior Division. Men*: 1st. Pasadena College. 2nd. University of

Oregon—(*Continued*)

Idaho. *Women*: 1st. Linfield College. 2nd. Northwest Nazarene. *Mixed Division*: 1st. Linfield College. 2nd. Oregon State.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Willamette University. 2nd. Linfield College. *Women*: 1st. Whitman College. 2nd. Oregon State College. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. College of Puget Sound. 2nd. Linfield College. *Women*: 1st. Oregon State College. 2nd. College of Pacific.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. College of Pacific. 2nd. Pacific University. *Women*: 1st. and 2nd. College of Pacific. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. San Bernardino Junior College. 2nd. Lewiston Norman (Idaho). *Women*: 1st. Washington State College. 2nd. Lewiston Normal (Idaho).

Impromptu, Men: 1st. Pacific University. 2nd. Whitworth College. *Women*: 1st. College of Pacific. 2nd. Linfield College. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. Seattle Pacific College. 2nd. Whitman College. *Women*: 1st. College of Pacific. 2nd. Washington State College.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Willamette University. 2nd. Whitman College. *Women*: 1st. and 2nd. Linfield College.

Congress of Human Relations, Winners: Oregon State, Seattle Pacific, Linfield College.

Sweepstakes: College of Pacific. *Outstanding Speaker Awards*: Bill Biddick and Margaret Stimson, College of Pacific.

PENNSYLVANIA

Slippery Rock Teachers College. Invitational Tournament. 6 years. Slippery Rock, Pa. March 1. Director: Carle B. Spotts. Participation: 10 colleges from 3 states, 14 teams. 3-round classification. Results:

Debate: 1st. Slippery Rock Teachers College. 2nd. Carnegie Institute of Technology.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence College. New England Intercollegiate Debate Tournament. 2nd. year. Providence, R. I. March 7, 8, 1941. Director: A. P. Regan, O.P. Participation: 8 colleges from 4 states. 14 teams. 6 rounds and percentage classification. Results:

Debate: 1st. Williams College. 2nd. Tie: University of Maine and Providence College.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Winthrop College. Dixie Tournament. 6 years. Rock Hill, S. C. December 4-7, 1940. Director: Warren G. Keith. Participation: 25 colleges from 13 states. 35 men's, 16 women's, Junior Division, 20 teams. 10 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Emory and Henry College. 2nd. Presbyterian College. *Women*: 1st. Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Alabama College. *Direct Clash Debate, Men*: 1st. North Carolina State College. *Women*: 1st. Appalachian Teachers College.

South Carolina—(*Continued*)

Junior Division, Men: 1st. Mars Hill College. *Women*: 1st. Virginia Intermont.

Oratory, Men: 1st. George Watkins. *Women*: 1st. Betty Swidensky.

Extempore, Men: 1st. Tie: Ralph Brumer, Bob Goldberg. *Women*: 1st. Jane Forester, Virginia Intermont.

Impromptu, Men: 1st. Tie: Ralph Brumer, George Watkins. *Women*: 1st. Frances Thackston.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Weston Hatfield, Wake Forest. *Women*: 1st. Shirley Kilgore, Virginia Intermont.

Radio, Men: 1st. Jack Klinck. *Women*: 1st. Betty Swidensky.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Lucille Haywood.

Problem Solving, Men: 1st. Jerry Hintas. *Women*: 1st. Wylene Clark.

Winthrop College. Grand Eastern Tournament. 5th year. Rock Hill, S. C. April 10-12. Director: Warren G. Keith. Participation: 50 colleges from 20 states. 53 men's and 25 women's teams. 10 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Kansas State Teachers. 2nd. Emory and Henry College. *Women*: 1st. Northwestern University. 2nd. Illinois State Normal University. *Direct Clash Debate*: 1st. East Tennessee State Teachers.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Robert Strout, Dartmouth College. *Women*: 1st. Ruby Vitzthum, Northwestern University.

South Carolina—(*Continued*)

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. George Cleland, Kansas State College. *Women*: 1st. Elizabeth Anne Parker, Farmville Teachers College (Va.)

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Earl Stallings, Carson-Newman College. *Women*: 1st. Grace Sidoti, Michigan State College.

Radio Announcing, Men: 1st. Grant Price, American University. *Women*: 1st. Mary S. Higginbotham, Roanoke College.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Eugene Purcell, Duke University. *Women*: 1st. Thelma Courtney, Farmville Teachers College (Va.)

Problem Solving, Men: 1st. Frank Barker, Davidson College. *Women*: 1st., Jewell Hardman, Kent State College (Ohio).

Best Individual Debaters, Men: Robert Oloun, Oklahoma Baptist College. *Women*: Georgia Bayless, Northwestern University.

SOUTH DAKOTA

University of South Dakota. Second Invitational Tournament for College Women. Vermillion, So. Dak. January 17-18. Director: Kenneth Christionson. Participation: 9 colleges from 3 states, 14 teams. 7 rounds. Results:

Debate: 1st. Nebraska Wesleyan University. 2nd. Hastings College.

Oratory: 1st. Janice Shuler, Hastings College. 2nd Clara Jo Hopkins, Nebraska Wesleyan.

Radio, Newscasting: 1st. Jean Park, Sioux Falls

South Dakota—(*Continued*)

College. 2nd. Tie: Florence Belson, University of South Dakota and Virginia Crawford, Nebraska Wesleyan.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Margot Truman, University of South Dakota and Betty Suchlson, Hastings College—tied. 2nd. Viola Bonacher, Sioux Falls College.

Debate, Individual Ranking: 1st. Virginia Crawford, Nebraska Wesleyan. 2nd. Janice Shuler, Hastings College.

TENNESSEE

Tennessee State Polytechnic Institute. Tennessee State Tournament. Cokeville, Tenn. February 27, March 1. Director: Herman Pinkerton. Participation: 13 colleges of Tennessee. 79 contestants. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Carson Newman College. 2nd Murfreesboro Teachers College. *Women*: 1st. Maryville College. 2nd. Bryan University. *Freshmen, Men*: 1st. Maryville College. 2nd. Murfreesboro Teachers College. *Women*: 1st. Maryville College. 2nd. Memphis State.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Johnson City Teachers College. 2nd. Maryville College. *Women*: 1st. University of Chattanooga. 2nd. Tennessee Tech.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Memphis State. 2nd. Maryville College. *Women*: 2nd. Maryville College. 2nd. Tennessee Tech.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Memphis State.

Tennessee—(*Continued*)

2nd. Carson Newman College. *Women*: 1st. Maryville College. 2nd. Carson Newman College. *After Dinner Speaking, Men*: 1st. Johnson City Teachers College. 2nd. Cumberland University. *Women*: 1st. University of Chattanooga. 2nd Maryville College.

Peace Oratory: 1st. Carson Newman College. 2nd. Maryville College. 3rd. Tennessee Tech.

TEXAS

Abilene Christian College. Ninth Annual Invitational Tournament. No report.

Baylor University. Tenth Annual Invitational Tournament. Waco, Tex. January 17-18. Director: Glenn R. Capp. Participation: 34 colleges from 5 states; 40 men's, 22 women's and 48 Junior Division teams. 8 rounds, with elimination at 5th round. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. and 2nd. Baylor University. *Women*: 1st. Baylor University. 2nd. Southeastern Teachers, Durant, Oklahoma. *Junior Division, Men*: 1st. Baylor University. 2nd. Southeastern State University. *Women*: 1st. University of San Antonio. 2nd. North Texas Teachers, Denton. *Mixed Debate*: 1st. Oklahoma Baptist College. 2nd. East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Paul Swinford, East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla. 2nd. James Prothro, Louisiana College. *Women*: 1st. Louise Blackwell,

Texas—(*Continued*)

Mary-Hardin Baylor College. Barbara Roberts, Baylor University.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Lester Kaminshy, Baylor University. 2nd. W. R. Brucker, Texas Christian University. *Women*: 1st. Mary L. Smith, North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Bruce Johnston, East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla.

Poetry Reading, Men: 1st. Joe D. Smith, Louisiana College. 2nd. Garnet Gracey, McMurry College. *Women*: 1st. Nelma Williams, North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Doris Ayers, Cameron Junior College.

Radio, Men: 1st. Wallace Hunter, Louisiana State Normal. 2nd. Aubrey Kendrick, Louisiana State Normal. *Women*: 1st. Mary E. Caldwell, Louisiana State Normal. 2nd. Rosemary Walker, Baylor University.

After Dinner Speaking: 1st. James Prothro, Louisiana College. 2nd. Maurice Denny, Cameron Junior College.

Hardin-Simmons University. Pi Kappa Delta, Province of the Lower Mississippi. Abilene, Tex. March 27-29. Director: E. O. Wood, Province Governor. Participation: 18 chapters from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana and Mississippi. 71 contestants and coaches. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Texas Christian University. 2nd. East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla.

Oratory, Men: 1st. James Prothro, Louisiana Col-

Texas—(*Continued*)

lege. 2nd. Paul Swinford, East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla. *Women*: Louise Blackwell, Mary Hardin-Baylor College. 2nd. Barbara Roberts, Baylor University.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Arthur Norred, Texas Christian University. 2nd. James White, Southeastern Oklahoma Teachers, Durant. *Women*: 1st. Mary Jane Duckworth, East Central Teachers, Oklahoma. 2nd. Byrdie Whitehead, Baylor University.

Poetry Reading, Men: 1st. Carroll Ellis, North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. James Prothro, Louisiana College. *Women*: 1st. Nelma Williams, North Texas Teachers, Denton. 2nd. Wanda Mae Clements, Hardin-Simmons.

After Dinner Speaking: 1st. Helen Holloway, East Central Teachers, Ada, Okla. 2nd. Jack Robbins, North Texas Teachers, Denton. 3rd. James Prothro, Louisiana College.

Southwestern State Teachers College. Intercollegiate Forensic Institute. 4th year. San Marcos, Tex. November 29, 30. Director: Hugh F. Seabury. Participation: 20 colleges from 2 states. 36 men's, 20 women's teams. 6 rounds and classification. Non-decision, individual oral and written criticism.

University of Texas. Southwestern Debate Tournament. 4 years. Austin, Tex. December 13-14. Director: Thomas A. Rousse. Participation: 6 colleges from 3 states. 5 rounds. Individual

Texas—(*Continued*)

ranking. Winner: Jimmie Adams, University of Texas.

UTAH

Utah State Agricultural College. Utah-Idaho Junior College Debate Meet. Logan, Utah. April 11-12. Director: Douglas Parkinson. Participation: 8 colleges from Utah and Idaho. 33 men's and 9 women's teams. 8 rounds, eliminations at 5th round. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. Branch Agricultural College, Cedar City, Utah. 2nd. University of Utah. *Lower Division, Women*: 1st. Branch Agricultural College. 2nd. Carbon College.

Oratory, Men: 1st. LaRue Olson, Snow College. 2nd. Ellis Boden, Albion Normal, Idaho.

Impromptu Speaking, Men: 1st. Max Lunt, Branch Agricultural College, Cedar City. 2nd. Glen Kilpatrick, University of Utah.

VIRGINIA

Virginia Intermont. Smoky Mountain Women's Tournament. Bristol, Va. February 15, 1941. Director: Roy C. Brown. Participation: 9 colleges from 4 states. 18 teams. 3 rounds and precentages. Results:

Debate (Regular type): 1st. Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Maryville College. *Direct Clash Debate*: 1st. Mars Hill College. 2nd. Virginia Intermont.

Virginia—(*Continued*)

Oratory: 1st. Marjorie Freels, Virginia Intermont. 2nd. Gwen Reed, Mars Hill College.

Extempore Speaking: 1st. Helen Wilson, Carson-Newman College. 2nd. Helen Moore, Virginia Intermont.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Lucille Haywood, Mars Hill College. 2nd. Betty Swidensky, Virginia Intermont.

WASHINGTON

Washington State College. Inland Empire Tournaments. Women's contest at Washington State, Pullman. Men's contest at University of Idaho. Junior Division at Washington State, Pullman. Women's December 5, 1940. Men's on December 14, 1940, and Junior Division on January 18, 1941. Participation is from Washington and Idaho colleges and junior colleges. Results:

Debate, Men: 1st. University of Idaho. 2nd. Whitman College. *Women*: Washington State College. 2nd. Whitman College. *Junior Division*: 1st. Washington State College. 2nd. Tie: Whitman College, College of Puget Sound, and Lewiston Normal (Idaho).

WISCONSIN

Eau Claire Teachers College. Fifth Annual Mid-Winter Tournament. Eau Claire, Wis. January 18, 1941. Director: C. D. Donaldson. Partici-

Wisconsin—(*Continued*)

pation: 13 colleges from 2 states. 4 rounds. Results:

Debate: 1st. A. Division: St. Olaf College. B. Division: Tie: River Falls Teachers College and Eau Claire Teachers College. Tournament winner (both divisions combined) Eau Claire Teachers College.

Eau Claire Teachers College. Fourth Annual. Speech Tournament. Eau Claire, Wis. April 26. Director: C. D. Donaldson. Participation: 5 colleges from 2 states. Results:

Oratory: 1st. Homer Hanson, St. Olaf College. 2nd. Katherine Lynch, River Falls Teachers College.

Learned Oratory: 1st. Nancy L. Van Dresser, Eau Claire Teachers College. 2nd. Donald Paffel, Superior State Teachers College.

Extempore Speaking: 1st. Irene Raawe, River Falls Teachers College. 2nd. William White, Eau Claire Teachers College.

Impromptu Speaking: 1st. William White, Eau Claire Teachers College. 2nd. Irene Raawe, River Falls Teachers College.

Poetry Reading: 1st. Kenneth Abrahamson, Superior Teachers College. 2nd. George Hopkins, River Falls Teachers College.

Prose Reading: 1st. Lorraine Andrews, St. Cloud Teachers College. 2nd. Carol Sher, Superior Teachers College.

Radio, Newscasting: 1st. Delores Kramschuster.

Wisconsin—(*Continued*)

River Falls Teachers College. 2nd. Barry Robinson, Eau Claire Teachers College.

Grand Trophy: River Falls Teachers College.

River Falls State Teachers College. River Falls "B" Tournament. River Falls, Wis. March 15. Director: Helen Loeb. Participation: 10 colleges from 3 states. 21 teams. 4 rounds. Results:

Debates: 1st. Tie: Iowa State Teachers College and St. Olaf College.

Stevens Point State Teachers College. Wisconsin Valley Tournament. 2 years. Stevens Point, Wis. February 19-20. Director: Leland M. Burroughs. Participation: 15 colleges from 6 states. 20 men's and 10 women's teams. 8 rounds. Results:

Debate, Men: Monmouth College, Ill. Women: Eau Claire Teachers College.

River Falls Teachers College. Pi Kappa Delta, Province of the Upper Mississippi. River Falls, Wis. April 5, 1941. Director: W. F. Schmidt. Participation: Pi Kappa Delta chapters of Wisconsin and Minnesota. Results:

Discussion, Men: 1st. Skogstad, St. Olaf. 2nd. R. J. Johnson, St. Thomas. *Women*: 1st. Kramschuster, River Falls. 2nd. McPhetres, Macalester.

Poetry Reading, Women: 1st. Possehl, Concordia College. 2nd. Froiland, St. Olaf.

Oratory, Men: 1st. Hopeman, Concordia College.

Wisconsin—(*Continued*)

2nd. Anderson, St. Olaf. *Women*: 1st. Possehl, Concordia College. 2nd. Lynch, River Falls.

Extempore Speaking, Men: 1st. Kilpatrick, St. Thomas. 2nd. Ditmanson, St. Olaf. *Women*: 1st. Fulton, Macalester College. 2nd. Raawe, River Falls.

After Dinner Speaking, Men: 1st. Schelander. 2nd. Treanor, St. Thomas. *Women*: 1st. Webb, River Falls. 2nd. Streich, St. Olaf.

University of Wisconsin. Delta Sigma Rho Tournament. 9th year. Madison, Wis. March 28-29. Director: H. L. Ewbank. Participation: 35 colleges from 8 states. 78 teams, senior division, 32 teams, junior division. 3 rounds, no decision.

Oratory: 1st. Elaine Childs, Michigan State College. 2nd. Tom McAllen, Dartmouth College. 3rd. Raymond Beard, Western Reserve University.

Public Discussion: 1st. Tom Brock, Albion College. 2nd. Seymour Goldman, Wayne University. 3rd. Clifton Stratton, Dartmouth College.

Whitewater State Teachers College. Invitational Tournament. 6 years. Whitwater, Wis. Feb. 14-15. Directors: E. H. Evans and D. H. Webster. Participation: 19 colleges from 3 states; 32 senior division teams and 30 junior division teams. 4 rounds.

Debate, Senior Division: 1st. Northern Michigan State Teachers College. 2nd. Tie: Eau Claire Teachers College, Lake Forest College, and Ripon College. *Junior Division*: 1st. University of Wis-

Wisconsin—(*Continued*)

consin Freshmen. 2nd. Tie: Augustana College, Carroll College, Northern Illinois Teachers College, Eau Claire Teachers College, Lawrence College, North Central College.

Discussion: 1st. Olaf Lee, Whitewater Teachers College. 2nd. Clyde Aurand, Northern Illinois Teachers College.

Individual Trophy: Al Burek, North Central College, and John Gates, Ripon College.

Kiwanis Trophy (for most wins in tournament): Eau Claire Teachers College. 2nd. Tie: Augustana College, Carroll College, Northern Illinois State Teachers College.